



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HN 23BZ 5

KD 5398 1(7)

HARVARD COLLEGE



LAMONT LIBRARY

HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.



HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY;
INCLUDING THAT OF
THE POPES
TO
THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOLUME VII.

NEW YORK:
SHELDON AND COMPANY.

BOSTON: GOULD AND LINCOLN.

M DCCC LXI.

20402
↓



UD 52981(7)



Trans. from
Lamont

RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY
H. O. HOUGHTON.

21
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

CONTENTS

OF

THE SEVENTH VOLUME.

BOOK XII. (*continued.*)

CHAPTER VI.

POPE JOHN XXII.

A.D.		PAGE
1313	Conclave at Carpentras.....	15
1315	Pope John XXII.....	18
	Fall of Royal House of France.....	21
	Persecutions for Witchcraft.....	24
	Spiritual Franciscans.....	25
	The Abbot Joachim.....	29
	The Everlasting Gospel.....	31
	John Peter Oliva.....	33
1281-1301	Wilhelmina.....	35
1280-86	Gerard Sagarelli of Parma.....	38
	Dolcino of Novara.....	41
	War.....	47
1304	Death of Margarita and of Dolcino.....	50
	Pope John claims treasures of Clement.....	51
	Persecutes the Spirituals.....	55
	William of Ockham.....	59
	Controversy on Papal power.....	61
	Insurrection of the Peasantry.....	64
	The Lepers.....	66

CHAPTER VII.

JOHN XXII. — LOUIS OF BAVARIA.

A.D.		PAGE
	Louis of Bavaria Emperor.....	68
1317	Affairs of Italy.....	71
	Excommunication of Visconti.....	74
1322	Battle of Muhldorf.....	75
	Process against Louis of Bavaria.....	76
	Excommunication.....	78
	German proclamation.....	81
1325	Treaty of Louis and Frederick.....	85
	Marsilio of Padua.....	89
	William of Ockham.....	94
1327	Louis descends into Italy.....	95
	At Pisa — Florence — Cecco d' Ascoli.....	96
	Coronation.....	99
	The Antipope — Nicolas V.....	103
	Louis abandons Rome.....	106
	Defection of Italy.....	109
	Fate of the Antipope.....	110
1330	Pope refuses all accommodation.....	112
	Heresy of Pope John XXII.....	113
1334	Philip of Valois, King of France.....	114
	Recantation — Death of John.....	118

CHAPTER VIII.

BENEDICT XII.

	Election.....	121
1335-6	Character — Decides the question of Beatific Vision <i>ib.</i>	
	King Philip at Avignon.....	125
1338	Weakness of Louis of Bavaria.....	126
	Embassy to Avignon.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Meeting of Louis and Edward of England.....	130
1342	Death of Benedict XII.....	132

CHAPTER IX.

CLEMENT VI.

A.D.		PAGE
	His acts — his court.....	135
	Clement and Louis of Bavaria.....	139
1344	Degrading terms accepted by Louis.....	141
1346	New Excommunication.....	144
1347	Queen Joanna of Naples.....	148

CHAPTER X.

RIENZI.

	Rienzi — parentage.....	151
1343-4	Rienzi at Avignon.....	155
	Rienzi in Rome.....	157
1347	Rising in Rome.....	162
	Power of Rienzi.....	167
	Procession of Aug. 1.....	171
	Coronation.....	172
	Insurrection of the nobles.....	176
1348-9	Fall and retreat of Rienzi.....	183
1351	Rienzi at Prague.....	186
1352	Surrendered to the Pope in Avignon — Petrarch.....	193

CHAPTER XI.

INNOCENT VI.

1350-1-2	The Black Plague.....	197
1352	Innocent VI. Pope.....	200
	Emperor Charles IV.....	202
	Cardinal Albornoz.....	203
1353-4	Rienzi in Italy — in Rome.....	205
	His death.....	207
1362	Death of Innocent.....	ib.

CHAPTER XII.

URBAN V.

A.D.		PAGE
	His character.....	209
	State of Europe—of Italy.....	211
	The Visconti.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Determines on return to Italy.....	215
1367	Return to Italy.....	216
1368	The Emperor at Rome.....	217
1370	Return to Avignon.....	218
	Death.....	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER XIII.

GREGORY XI.

	His character.....	219
	State of Italy.....	<i>ib.</i>
1372	Free Companies.....	220
1376	Catherine of Sienna.....	223
	Gregory arrives in Italy.....	224
	His death.....	226

BOOK XIII.

CHAPTER I.

THE SCHISM.

1378	The Conclave.....	228
	Tumults.....	229
	Election of Archbishop of Bari.....	233
	Coronation.....	235
	Character of Urban VI.....	236

A.D.	PAGE
	Cardinals at Anagni.....
	Declaration against Urban VI.....
	Clement VII. — Antipope — Schism.....
	239
	240
	243

CHAPTER II.

THE RIVAL POPES.

	Acts of Urban — of Clement.....	247
1380	Successes of Urban.....	248
1381	Charles of Durazzo in Naples.....	251
1382	Death of Queen Joanna — Louis of Anjou.....	<i>ib.</i>
1383	The Pope at Naples — Buttillo Prignano.....	253
1384	Quarrel of Charles and Urban.....	255
	Arrest of Cardinals.....	257
1385-6	Urban flies to Genoa.....	259
1386	Death of Charles of Durazzo.....	261
1389	Death of Urban VI.....	263
	Clement VII. at Avignon.....	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER III.

BONIFACE IX. — BENEDICT XIII.

	Accession of Boniface IX.....	267
	Simony — Annates — Nepotism.....	270
1394	Death of Clement VII.....	272
	Benedict XIII.....	274
1393	Boniface IX. in Perugia.....	275
1399	In Rome.....	276
1400	Jubilee.....	277
	Gian Galeazzo of Milan.....	278
1395	Benedict XIII. — Council at Paris.....	279
	Peter d'Ailly.....	283
1398	Benedict besieged in Avignon.....	285
1398-1403	Imprisonment and flight.....	287
1404	Death of Boniface IX.....	290

CHAPTER IV.

INNOCENT VII. — GREGORY XII. — BENEDICT XIII.

A.D.		PAGE
	Election of Innocent — Insurrection in Rome.....	292
	Ladislaus of Naples.....	293
1405	Death of Innocent.....	296
	Gregory XII.....	<i>ib.</i>
1407	Meeting appointed at Savona.....	298
1407-8	Ladislaus in Rome.....	301
	Cardinals at Pisa.....	303
1408	Benedict flies to Spain.....	306

CHAPTER V.

COUNCIL OF PISA.

GREGORY XII., BENEDICT XIII., ALEXANDER V., AND JOHN XXIII.

	Cardinals summon the Council.....	307
	Benedict's Council at Perpignan.....	310
	Gregory's Council.....	311
1409	Meeting of Council at Pisa.....	312
	Both Popes deposed.....	316
	Election of Alexander V.....	320
	Bull in favor of the Friars.....	323
1410	Death of Alexander — Election of John XXIII..	328
	John XXIII. — Balthasar Cossa.....	<i>ib.</i>
1411	Crusade against Ladislaus.....	334
	Pope submits and again quarrels with Ladislaus....	<i>ib.</i>
	Flies from Rome.....	337
1413	The Emperor Sigismund.....	339
	The Council of Constance determined.....	342
1414	Death of Ladislaus.....	344

CHAPTER VI.

WYCLIFFE.

A.D.		PAGE
	Teutonic England.....	346
	Edward II.....	348
	Wars of Edward III.....	350
	Archbishop of Canterbury.....	352
1324	Birth of Wycliffe.....	355
	Wycliffe at Oxford.....	356
	Preferments.....	362
	Discussion on tribute to Rome.....	363
1371	Parliamentary Petition against Hierarchy.....	365
1376	Wycliffe Commissioner at Bruges.....	370
	The Good Parliament.....	373
	William of Wykeham.....	375
1377	Death of Edward III.....	376
	Wycliffe at St. Paul's.....	377
	Proceedings against Wycliffe.....	380
	Wycliffite Teachers.....	383
	Translation of the Bible.....	384
1381	Insurrection of the Peasants.....	385
	Council at the Grey Friars, London.....	389
1382	Parliament at Oxford — Convocation.....	393
	Wycliffe at Lutterworth.....	395
	Crusade — Spencer Bishop of Norwich.....	396
1384	Death of Wycliffe.....	399

CHAPTER VII.

THE LOLLARDS.

	Queen Anne of Bohemia.....	405
	Petition of Lollards.....	407
1399	Accession of Henry IV.....	408
1400	Statute De Hæretico Comburendo.....	410
	William Sautree Martyr.....	412
1409	Badbee and Thorpe.....	415
	Oldcastle, Lord Cobham.....	417
1417	His death.....	425

CHAPTER VIII.

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

A.D.		PAGE
1415	Assemblage.....	427
	Pope John XXIII.....	430
	Frederick of Austria.....	431
	John Huss.....	438
	Huss at Constance.....	444
	Huss in prison.....	446
	Arrival of the Emperor.....	448
	Number and Members of the Council.....	450

CHAPTER IX.

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE—JOHN XXIII.—JOHN HUSS.

1416	Threatening Signs against the Pope.....	454
	The Emperor abandons John Huss.....	455
	Deputies from Antipopes.....	457
	Charges against the Pope.....	460
	Pope John's renunciation.....	462
	Flight of the Pope.....	468
	Gerson.....	471
	The Pope at Schaffhausen.....	472
	Proceedings of Council.....	474
	Surrender and Imprisonment of the Pope.....	479
	John Huss.....	480
	Examination.....	486
	Huss refuses to recant.....	493
	Sentence.....	496
	Execution.....	497
	Proceedings in Bohemia.....	499
	Jerome of Prague.....	501
	The three Johns — John XXIII., John Huss, Jean Petit.....	505

CHAPTER X.

CLOSE OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE — POPE MARTIN V.

A.D.		PAGE
1416	Death of Robert Hallam.....	512
	Election of Martin V.....	513
	Struggles for Reform.....	519
	Concordats.....	520
	Dissolution of the Council.....	523
	Results.....	<i>ib.</i>
1419	Martin in Florence.....	525
1421	Martin in Rome — State of Rome.....	528
	Martin on Statute of Præmunire.....	531
1431	Death of Martin.....	536

CHAPTER XI.

EUGENIUS IV. — HUSSITE WAR.

	Election of Eugenius IV.....	538
	Seizes Martin's Treasure.....	539
	Bohemian War.....	541
1419	Death of King Wenzel — Accession of Sigismund..	544
1420-1	Ziska — Battles of Wyschehrad, Saaz, and Deutsch- brod.....	545
1426	Procopius — Battle of Aussitz.....	547
1431	Invasion of Germany — Battle of Taass.....	548

CHAPTER XII.

COUNCIL OF BASLE.

	The Legate Julian Caesarini.....	553
	State of Germany.....	555
	Emperor Sigismund in Italy.....	557
1433	Coronation.....	561
	Council declared lawful.....	<i>ib.</i>
1434	Eugenius flies from Rome.....	564
1433	Bohemians at Basle.....	567



HISTORY

OF

LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

BOOK XII. (CONTINUED.)

CHAPTER VI.

POPE JOHN XXII.

CLEMENT V. had expired near Carpentras, a city about fifteen miles from Avignon, near the foot of Mont Ventoux. At Carpentras the ^{Conclave at Carpentras.} Conclave assembled, according to later usage, in the city near the place where the Pope had died, to elect a successor to the Gascon Pontiff. Of twenty-three Cardinals six only were Italians. With them the primary object was the restoration of the Papacy to Rome. The most sober might tremble lest the Papal authority should hardly endure the continued if not perpetual avulsion of the Popedom from its proper seat. Would Christendom stand in awe of a Pope only holding the Bishopric of Rome as a remote appanage to the Pontificate, only nominally seated on the actual throne of St. Peter, in a cathedral unennobled, unhallowed by any of the ancient or sacred traditions of the Cæsarean, the Pontifical city? Would it endure a Pope setting a flagrant example of non-residence to the whole ecclesiastical order; no longer an independent

sovereign in the capital of the Christian world, amid the patrimony claimed as the gift of Constantine and Charlemagne, but lurking in an obscure city, in a narrow territory, and that territory not his own? Avignon was in Provence, which Charles of Anjou had obtained in right of his wife. The land had descended to his son Charles II. of Naples; on the death of Charles, to the ruling sovereign, Robert of Naples.¹ The Neapolitan Angevine house had still maintained the community of interests with the parent monarchy; and this territory of Provence, Avignon itself, was environed nearly on all sides by the realm of France, that realm whose king, not yet dead, had persecuted a Pope to death, persecuted him after death.

The Italian, but more especially the Roman, Cardinals contemplated with passionate distress
The Italian Cardinals. Rome deserted by her spiritual sovereign, and deprived of the pomp, wealth, business of the Papal Court. The head and representative of this party was the Cardinal Napoleon, of the great Roman house of the Orsini. A letter addressed by him to the King of France shows this Italian feeling, the hatred and contempt towards the memory of Clement V. He bitterly deplores, and expresses his deep contrition at his own weakness, and that of the other Cardinals at Perugia, in yielding to the election of Clement. The Church under his rule had gone headlong to ruin. Rome was a desert; the throne of St. Peter, even that of Christ himself, broken up; the patrimony of St. Peter held rather than governed, by robbers; Italy neglected and abandoned to strife and insurrection; not only cathe-

¹ See, further on, the purchase of Avignon from Queen Joanna of Naples by Clement VI.

dral churches, the meanest prebends, had run to waste.¹ Of twenty-four Cardinals created by Pope Clement not one was sufficient for the high office.² The Italian Cardinals had been treated by him with contemptuous disrespect, never summoned but to hear some humiliating or heart-breaking communication. The Pope had more than meditated, he had determined, the utter ruin of the Church, the removal of the Papacy to some obscure corner of Gascony: "When I," said the Orsini, "and the Italian Cardinals voted for the elevation of Pope Clement, it was not to remove the Holy See from Rome, and to leave desolate the sanctuary of the Apostles."

The Italians, conscious of their weakness, were disposed to an honorable compromise. They ~~The Gascons.~~ put forward William Cardinal of Palestrina, a Frenchman by birth, and of high character. But in the French faction there was still an inner faction, that of the Gascons. Clement had crowded his own kindred and countrymen into the Conclave.³ Against them the French acted with the Italians. The contest within the Conclave was fierce, and seemed interminable. Provisions began to fail in Carpentras. The strife spread from the Cardinals within to their parti-

¹ "Quasi nulla remansit Cathedralis Ecclesia, vel alicujus ponderis præbendula, quæ non sit potius perditioni quam provisioni exposita." — Baluz. Collect. Act. No. XLIII. p. 289.

² Such seems the sense of the (corrupt?) passage. — "De XXIV. Cardinalibus quos in Ecclesiâ posuit nullus in Ecclesiâ est repertus, quæ cum aliquando credita fuit, sufficiens (tes?) habere personas, sed per eum fuit hoc." The twenty-four, I presume, include all Clement's promotions, some dead.

³ "Guasconi ch' erano gran parte del collegio voleano l' elezione in loro, e li Cardinali Italiani e Franceschi e Provenzali non acconsentivano; si erano stati gastigato del Papa Guascone." — Villani, ix. 79.

sans without. The Gascons rose, attacked the houses of the Italian Cardinals, and plundered the traders and merchants from the South. A fierce troop of knights and a host of rabble approached and thundered at the gates of the Conclave "Death to the Italian Cardinals!" A fire broke out during the attack and pillage of the houses, which threatened the hall of Conclave.

Conclave flies. The Cardinals burst through the back wall, crept ignobly through the hole, fled and dispersed on all sides.¹

For two years and above three months the Papal See was vacant.² Impatient Christendom began to murmur. The King of France, Louis le Hutin, was called upon to interpose both by the general voice and by his own interests. The office devolved on his brother Philip, Count of Ponthieu. By him the reluctant Cardinals were brought partly by force, partly inveigled, to Lyons. The pious fraud of Philip Conclave at Lyons. was highly admired. He solemnly promised that they should not be imprisoned in the Conclave, but have free leave to depart wherever they would. Philip was suddenly summoned to Paris by the death of the King of France, but he left the Conclave under strict and severe guard.

At length they came to a determination. James, Cardinal of Porto, was proclaimed Pope, and assumed John XXII. the name of John XXII. John was of small, as some describe him, of deformed stature. He was

¹ Bernard Guido apud Baluzium. Epist. Encyc. Cardinal. Italarum de incendio urbis Carpenteratensis apud Baluz. No. XLII. Raynald. sub ann. 1314. The Continuator of Nangis attributes the fire to a nephew of Clement V. See also the Constitution of John XXII. against the robbers and incendiaries.

² 2 years, 3 months, 17 days. — Bernard Guido.

born in Cahors, of the humblest parentage, his father a cobbler. This, if true, was anything but dishonorable to the Pope, still less to the Church. During an age when all without was stern and inflexible aristocracy, all functions and dignities held by feudal inheritance, in the Church alone a man of extraordinary talents could rise to eminence; and this was the second cobbler's son who had sat on the throne of St. Peter.¹ The cobbler's son asserted and was believed by most to have a right to decide conflicting claims to the Imperial Crown, and aspired to make an Emperor of his own.²

James of Cahors had followed in his youth the fortunes of an uncle, who had a small trading capital, to Naples. He settled in that brilliant and pleasant city. He was encouraged in the earnest desire of study by a Franciscan friar, but refused to enter the Order. The poor scholar was recommended to the instructor of the King's children. Though in a menial office, he manifested such surprising aptitude both for civil and canon law, that he was permitted to attend the lectures of the teachers. The royal favor shone upon him. He was employed in the kingdom of Naples, in Rome, and in other parts of the world; took orders, received preferment, was appointed by Boniface VIII. Bishop of Frejus, in the Provençal dominions of the King of Naples. But he preferred to dwell on the sunny shores of Naples; perhaps under the immediate sight of the

¹ See Life of Urban IV., vol. iv. p. 413.

² Baluzius produces a passage from Albertinus to make out John XXII. of knightly or noble birth. The controversy may be seen in Baluzius and in a note to Raynaldus sub ann.

King. While he was on a mission to Clement V. the great see of Avignon fell vacant. To the astonishment of the King of Naples it was conferred on the obscure Bishop of Frejus. The Pope explained that the promotion was made on account of strong recommendatory letters from the King himself. The letters had been written, and the royal seal affixed, without the King's knowledge. But the consummate science of the Bishop of Avignon in both branches of the law won the confidence and favor of the Pope. He was created Cardinal for his invaluable services, especially at the Council of Vienne in the two great causes — the condemnation of the Templars, and the prosecution of the memory of Boniface. All Europe watched the Conclave of Lyons. Robert of Naples thought of his former subject, the companion of his studies. A Pope attached to Naples would aid him in the reconquest of Sicily, and in his strife as head of the Guelfs in Italy against Pisa and the Lombard tyrants. The influence, the gold of Naples overcame the scruples of the stubborn Italians; Napoleon Orsini yielded; the cobbler's son of Cahors was supreme Pontiff.¹ It is said that he made a promise never to mount horse or mule till he Oct. 2, 1316. should set out on his return to Italy.² He kept his vow; after his coronation at Lyons, he dropped down the Rhone in a boat to Avignon, and there fixed the seat of his Pontificate.

¹ This circumstantial account of the life of John XXII. in Ferretus Vicentinus (Muratori, R. I. S. ix. 1166) bears strong marks of veracity. By another account, the Election was by compromise. The Cardinals agreed to elect the Pope named by the Cardinal of Porto: he named himself. — See note of Mansi on Raynaldus. Villani in loc. cit. Compare also the close of encyclic letter addressed to Robert of Naples.

² Ptolem. Luc. apud Baluz. p. 198, note, p. 793.

This establishment in Avignon declared that John XXII. was to be a French not an Italian Pontiff, the successor of Clement V., not of the long line of his Roman ancestors. His first promotion of Cardinals, followed by two others, at different periods of his Pontificate, spoke plainly to Christendom the same resolute purpose. His choice might seem even more narrow than that of his predecessor, not merely confined to French, or even to Gascon prelates, but to men connected by birth or office with his native town of Cahors. The College would be almost a Cahorsin Conclave. Of the first eight, one was his own nephew, three from the diocese of Cahors, one French bishop the Chancellor of the King of France, one Gascon, only one Roman an Orsini. Of the next seven, one was from the city, three from the diocese of Cahors (of these one was Archbishop of Salerno, one Archbishop of Aix); the three others were French or Provençals. At a third promotion of ten Cardinals, six were French prelates; three Romans, one Archbishop of Naples, one an Orsini, one a Colonna; one Spaniard, Bishop of Carthagen^a.¹ The Bishop alone of his native city of Cahors, as will soon appear, met with a different fate from the terrible justice or vengeance of the Pope.

The relation of John XXII. to the throne of France was greatly changed from that of his predecessor. There was no Philip the Fair to extort from the reluctant Pope, as the price of his advancement, the lavish gratification of his

¹ The promotions, Dec. 17, 1316, Dec. 20, 1320, Dec. 16, 1328. — Bernard Guido, pp. 134, 138, 140.

pride, avarice, or revenge : no powerful King, backed by a fierce nobility, and a people proud of their dawning freedom. A rapid succession of feeble sovereigns held in turn the sceptre of France, and then sank into obscurity. The house of Philip was paying condign retribution in its speedy and mysterious extinction. Divine Providence might have looked with indifference (so Christendom was taught, and Christendom was prone enough to think) on all his extortions, cruelties, and iniquities to his subjects, on even his barbarities, but nothing less than the shame of his sons, each the husband of an adulteress, and the utter failure of his line, could atone for his impious hostility to the fame, person, and memory of Boniface. Louis le Hutin (the disorderly) had died during the Conclave at Lyons, after a reign of less than two years.¹ He had caused his first wife, accused of violating his bed, to be strangled or smothered ; and had married Clementine of Hungary, niece of the King of Naples. He died leaving her pregnant. The death of her son soon after his birth,² left the throne to the second son of Philip the Fair, Philip the Long. The accession of Philip (though his brother left a daughter) asserted the authority and established forever the precedent of what was called the Salic Law, which excluded females from the succession to the throne of France.³

The Pope in all the briefs addressed with great frequency to the King, divulged his knowledge of the weakness of the crown. His

The Pope's
briefs.

¹ From Nov. 24, 1314, to June 5, 1316.

² Born Nov. 15, 1316, died five days after.

³ Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, ix. p. 352.

language is that of protecting and condescending interest, but of a superior in age and learning, as in dignity. He first rebukes the King's habit of talking in church on subjects of business or amusement. He reproves the national disrespect for Sunday ; on that day the courts of law were open, and it was irreverently chosen as a special day for shaving the head and trimming the beard. He assumed full authority on all subjects which might be brought under ecclesiastical discipline. Of his sole authority he separated eight new suffragan bishoprics, Montauban, Lombes, St. Papoul, Rieux, Lavaur, Mirepoix, Saint Pons, and Alais, from the great Archbishopric of Toulouse. He did the same with the Archbishopric of Narbonne. His power and his reputation for learning caused his mandates for the reformation of the universities of Paris, Orleans, and Toulouse to be received with respectful submission. His chief censure is directed against the scholastic theology, which had in some of its distinguished and subtile writers begun to show dangerous signs of insubordination to the Church of Rome. William of Ockham was deeply concerned in the rebellious movement of part, it might at one time seem of the whole, of the Franciscan body: he had published the powerful treatise in defence of the Imperial against the Papal power.

But the profound learning of John XXII., though reputed to embrace not only theology, but both branches of the law, the canon and civil, was but the melancholy ignorance of his age. He gave the sanction of the Papal authority and of his own name to the belief, to the vulgar belief, in sorcery and magic. He sadly showed the sincerity of his own credulity, as well as his relent-

less disposition, by the terrible penalties exacted upon wild accusations of such crimes. The old poetic magic of the Greeks and Romans, the making an image of wax which melted away before a slow fire, and with it the strength and life of the sorcerer's victim, was now most in vogue. Louis le Hutin was supposed to have perished through this damnable art: half-melted images of the King and of Charles of Valois had been discovered or produced; a magician and a witch were executed for the crime.¹ Even the Pope's life was not secure either in its own sanctity, or by the virtue of a serpentine ring lent to John by Margaret Countess of Foix. The Pope had pledged all his goods, movable and immovable, for the safe restoration of this invaluable talisman; he had pronounced an anathema against all who should withhold it from its rightful owner. A dark conspiracy was formed, or supposed to be formed, in which many of the Cardinals were involved, against the life of the Pope.² Whether they were jealous of his elevation, or resented his establishment of the See at Avignon, appears not; but the Cardinals made their peace. The full vengeance of the Pope fell on a victim of the next rank, not only guilty, it was averred, of meditating this impious deed, but of compassing it by diabolic arts. Gerold, Bishop of the Pope's native city, Cahors, had been highly honored and trusted by Clement V. On this charge of capital treason, he was now degraded, stripped of his episcopal attire, and condemned to perpetual imprisonment. But the wrath of the Pope was not satiated. He was actually

*Trials for
magic.*

¹ Sismondi, ix. 358.

² Raynaldus sub ann. 1317, c. lii.

flayed alive and torn asunder by four horses.¹ There is a judicial proceeding against another Bishop (of Aix) for professing and practising magical arts at Bologna. A fierce and merciless Inquisition was set up; tortures, executions multiplied; many suffered for the manufacture of the fatal waxen images, a physician and several clerks. The Pope issued an edict of terrible condemnation, thereby asserting the reality of countless forms of sorcery, diabolic arts, dealing with evil spirits, shutting familiar devils in looking-glasses, circlets, and rings. How much human blood has been shed by human folly!

But if the unrelenting Pope thus commanded the sacrifice of so many pretenders, if indeed ^{The Franciscans.} they were really pretenders, to secret dealing with supernatural agencies, it was no imaginary danger to the Papal power which threatened it from another quarter. During the Papacy of John XXII., that fanatic movement towards religious freedom which arose in the Mendicant Orders broke out, not only into secret murmurs against the wealth and tyranny of the Church, but proclaimed doctrines absolutely subversive of the whole sacerdotal system, and entered into perilous alliance with every attempt to restore the Ghibelline and Imperial interest in Italy. The Church itself — the most zealous, obedient, Papal part of the Church — gave birth to these new sectaries, who professed never to have left it, and to be themselves the Church within the Church.

The great schism of the Franciscan Order has al-

¹ Bernard Guido, 488, 680. Raynaldus, 1317, liv. Gallia Christiana, i. p. 138.

² Raynaldus, *ibid.*

ready been traced in its commencement: and in the rise *Schism.* and consequences of that inevitable question, the possession of property. We have seen the worldly successor of the unworldly St. Francis, Elias, ruling, and repelled from the Order; the succession of alternately mild and severe generals till the time of John of Parma. We have seen the vacillating policy of the Popes, unwilling to estrange, unable to reconcile the irreconcilable tenets of these antagonists, who had sworn to the same rule, honored the same Founder, called themselves by the same name, professed to live the same life. The mitigation of the rule by Gregory IX., and what seemed the happy evasion of Innocent IV., were equally repudiated by the more severe. Innocent would relieve them from the treason to the principles of their Master, and at the same time attach them more closely to the Papal See, by declaring all their property, houses, domains, church furniture, to be vested in the Pope. The usufruct only was granted by him to the brethren. The Spirituals disclaimed the worldly equivocation. The famous constitution of Nicolas III. reawakened, encouraged, seemed at least to invest with the Papal sanction, their austere zeal. However indulgent some of its provisions, its assertion of their tenets was almost beyond their hopes. The total abdication of property was true meritorious holiness.¹ Christ, as an example of perfection, was absolutely, entirely a Franciscan Mendicant. The use of

¹ "Abdicatio proprietatis hujusmodi omnium rerum non tam in speciali quam etiam in communi propter Deum meritoria est, et sancta, quam et Christus viam perfectionis ostendens, verbo docuit, et exemplo firmavit. Nec his quisquam potest obsistere." — Nicolas III. Bulla Excit. &c.

a scrip or purse was only a tender condescension to human infirmity.¹

So grew this silent but widening schism. The Spiritualists did not secede from the community, ^{The Fraticelli, the Spiritualists.} but from intercourse with their weak brethren. The more rich, luxurious, learned, became the higher Franciscans; the more rigid, sullen, and disdainful became the lowest. While the Church in Assisi was rising over the ashes of St. Francis in unprecedented splendor, adorned with all the gorgeousness of young art, the Spiritualists denounced all this magnificence as of this world; the more imposing the services, the more sternly they retreated among the peaks and forests of the Apennines, to enjoy undisturbed the pride and luxury of beggary. The lofty and spacious convents were their abomination;² they housed themselves in huts and caves; there was not a single change in dress, in provision for food, in worship, in study, which they did not denounce as a sin — as an act of Apostasy.³ Wherever the Franciscans were,

¹ "Egit namque Christus et docuit opera perfectionis; egit etiam infirma, sicut interdum in fugâ patet et loculis." — Ibid. The adversaries of the Spiritualists objected that our Lord and his apostles had a purse. "Yes," they rejoined, "but it was intrusted to Judas: if it had been for our example, it would have been given to St. Peter."

² The Devils held a chapter (it was revealed to a Brother) against the Order. Their object was to nullify the three vows. "La Pauvreté, en enduisant à faire des somptueux monastères et magnifiques couvents; la Chastité, alléchant les religieux à la familiarité et fréquentation des femmes; l'Obedience, en pourchassant l'appuy et la faveur des princes séculiers, et par dissensions domestiques." — *Chroniques*, ii. xxxv.

³ The tenets of the Spirituals are summed up in a citation from an ancient Carta d'Appella in the possession of the author of a "Vita de S. Francesco: Foligno, 1824." He calls it a Philippic or Verrine Oration. "Peccato la tonaca perchè ampliata e non vile nel prezzo è nel colore. Peccato l' interior vesta, perchè non accordata se non nel caso di necessità. Peccato la cerca del grano, del vino e d' altri generi, ad il farne la provisione nelle cantine, e nelle granai infino a tutto l' anno. Peccato più d' averne in

and they were everywhere, the Spiritualists were keeping up the strife, protesting, and putting to shame these recreant sons of the common father.

But the Spiritualists might have kept up this civil war within the Order ; they might have denounced as sin the tunic, if too ample, or not coarse or dull enough in color ; the provision of corn in granaries ; the possession of money for the purpose of exchange ; the receiving money for masses or funerals ; the accepting bequests, though not in money ; the building splendid convents, wearing the costly priestly dresses, and having gold and silver vessels for the altar ; the partial bestowal of absolution on benefactors and partisans, from interest, not from merit ; they might have stood aloof in perpetual bitter remonstrance against the pride, wealth, luxury, and the ambition to rule in courts, prevalent among their more famous brethren : all this was without peril to the Church or to the Pope. It was their revolutionary doctrine, superadded to and superseding that of the Church, which made them objects of terror and persecution.

Like all religious enthusiasts, the Spiritual Franciscans were lovers of prophecy. In their desert hermitages, in their barefoot wanderings over the face of the earth, amid the ravines of the Apennines, or the vol-
avanzo, è venderlo a cambiate per comprar robe per le tonace ; così qualunque altra vendita di cera, di pennoni, di mortori, &c., sebbene remanesse il denaro presso el Sindaco. Peccato il ricever per mezza di questo il danaro per le Messe e Funerali, o spontaneamente offerta in limosine, o questuando da devoti per far festa nelle chiese dell' ordine : e peccato il servirsene lo stesso de' legati, specialmente fissi col fondo, qualunque fosse il titolo ed ancorchè fossino pagabili in roba, e non in moneta. *Peccato le fabbriche de' Conventi, perchè grandi e spaziosi, e paramenti sacri, perchè de seta con oro e argento, e per lo stesso motivo le altri utensili della chiesa. E peccato finalmente la assoluzione che si danno nel Sacramento della Penitenzia, a i Benefattori e amorevoli, perchè data per interesse e contra il merito.*"

canic cliffs of Apulia, in their exile in foreign climes, in their pilgrimages, and no less in their triumphant elation when Popes seemed to acknowledge the severest rule of St. Francis to be Christian perfection, they brooded over strange revelations of the future, which were current under various names, either interpretations of the Apocalypse, or prophecies of a bolder tone. The Abbot Joachim,^{The Abbot Joachim.} of Flora in the kingdom of Naples, lives as a Saint in the Calendar of Rome; but the Eternal Gospel ascribed to the Abbot Joachim was to Christianity, especially the Christianity of the Latin Church, what Christianity had been to Judaism, at once its completion and abolition. The Abbot Joachim, indeed, was not only revered as a Saint, the whole Church invested him in the mantle of a prophet; the Churchmen themselves accepted as of divine revelation all his wild ravings or terrible denunciations which could be directed against her enemies. Frederick II. had been doomed to ruin in the vaticinations of the Abbot of Flora; but the Church discovered not, or refused to discover, what elsewhere, among the more daring enthusiasts, passed for the true, if concealed, doctrines of Joachim; the Eternal Gospel. This either lurked undetected in his acknowledged writings, in the Concordance of the Old and New Testaments, and his Comment on Jeremiah; or at least for half a century it awoke neither the blind zeal of its believers, nor the indignant horror of the higher ranks of the Church. So long the Abbot Joachim was an orthodox, or unsuspected prophet.¹ But the holy ^{Introduction to Eternal Gospel.}

¹ The Abbot Joachim was born A. D. 1145, died A. D. 1202. Pope Honorius III. avouched his orthodoxy. The *Acta Sanctorum* (vol. vii.) and the

horror broke out at once on the publication, at the close of this period, of the Introduction to the Eternal Gospel. The Introduction placed what was called the "doctrine of Joachim" in a distinct and glaring light, perhaps first wrought it into a system.¹ The Church stood aghast. The monks of the older Orders, the Dominicans, the more lax and the more learned Franciscans, the Clergy, the Universities, the Pope himself, joined in the alarm. We have heard, in Paris, the popular cry, the popular satire; we have heard the powerful voice of William of St. Amour seizing this all-dreaded writing, to crush both Orders of Mendicants, and expel them from the University.² It was denounced at Rome: the Pope Alexander IV. commanded the instant and total destruction of the book. Excommunication was pronounced against all who should possess the book, unless it was brought in and burned within a stated time. No one would own the perilous authorship. It was ascribed by the more orthodox Franciscans to a Dominican, by the Dominicans more justly to a Franciscan. There is little doubt that it came either from John of Parma, or his school.

Annals of the Cistercian Order contain the life of Joachim, his austerities, his preaching, his wonders. The heterodoxy on the Trinity imputed to him by the fourth Lateran Council was probably founded on misapprehension, at all events was fully recanted. The best and most full modern account of this remarkable man is in Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter*, t. iii. p. 72 *et seq.* Stuttgart, 1850. See on his writings authentic and unauthentic, p. 82.

¹ According to Hahn, there was a gradual approximation to the Book, through unauthentic writings attributed to Abbot Joachim, in which he is made more and more furiously to denounce the abuses in the Church. This is the new Babylon. — p. 101.

² Compare back, vol. vi. p. 75, and extracts from *Roman de la Rose* and *Ruteboeuf*.

The proscription of the book but endeared it to its followers. The visions were only the more authentic, the greater the terror they excited. The Eternal Gospel.

With the Spiritualists the heresy of John of Parma, and his concern with the prophecies, was among his chief titles to sanctity; on the other hand, skilfully detached from these opinions, he became, like Joachim himself, a canonized saint.¹ The doctrine of the Introduction blended with and stimulated all the democracy of religion, which would bring down the pomp, pride, wealth of the hierarchy, and bow it before the not less proud poverty of the Franciscans. The enemies of the Order proclaimed it as the universal doctrine of the Friar Minors: they would hear no disclaimer. The Spirituals, the Fraticelli, chiefly the Tertiaries of the Order, disdained to disclaim, they rather openly avowed their belief, and scoffed at their more prudent or less faithful brethren. But the Eternal Gospel, as announced in the Introduction, was the absolute abrogation of the Christian faith. There were to be three estates of man, three revelations of God. Judaism was that of the Father, Christianity that of the Son; that of the Holy Ghost was to come, was coming, was harbingered by irrefragable signs. At the commencement, and in the middle of the thirteenth century, its dawn was more and more anxiously awaited. All ecclesiastical, all political events were watched and interpreted as its preparation. Passages were probably interpolated in Joachim's real writings, announcing the two great new Orders, more especially St. Francis and his followers, as the Baptists of this new Gospel.² The

¹ *Acta Sanctorum*, March xix.

² The Life of Christ by St. Bonaventura, by its close assimilation of St.

new Gospel was to throw into the shade the four antiquated Evangelists. The Old Testament shone with the brightness of the stars, the New with that of the moon, the Eternal Gospel with that of the sun.¹ The Old Testament was the outer Holy court, the New the Holy place, the Eternal Gospel the Holy of Holies. No omens of the coming of the new kingdom of the Holy Ghost were so awful or so undeniable as the corruptions of the Church: and those corruptions were measured not by a lofty moral standard, but by their departure from the perfection, the poverty of St. Francis. The Pope, the hierarchy, fell of course. But who was to work the wonderful change? Whether the temporal sovereign, Frederick II., returned to earth, or a prince of the house of Arragon, Frederick of Sicily, varied with the circumstances of the times, and the greater activity and success of Ghibellinism. The more religious looked for an unworldly head, St. Francis himself, or some one in the spirit of St. Francis.

On minds in this state of expectant elation, came, at Cœlestine V. the close of the century, the sudden election to the Popedom of Cœlestine V., one of themselves in lowliness and poverty, a new St. Francis, to the Spiritualists a true Spiritual. His followers were by no means all believers in the Eternal Gospel, but doubtless many believers in the Eternal Gospel were among his followers; and in him they looked for the dawn of the

Francis to the Saviour (singularly contrasted as it is with the genuine Gospels, which it might seem intended to supersede among the Franciscans), appears almost designed to break this hostile collision.

¹ "Autant che per sa grant valeur
Soit de clarté, soit de chaleur,
Surmonte le Soleil la Lune,
Qui trop est plus trouble et trop brune."

Roman de la Rose, 12436.

kingdom of the Holy Ghost. Many probably of both classes crowded into the Order sanctioned by the Pope; the Cœlestinians, who, though suppressed by Boniface VIII., still maintained their profound reverence for the one genuine Pope, were bound together in common brotherhood by their sympathy with Cœlestine and their hatred of Boniface: they became a wide if not strictly organized sect.

During the Papacy of Boniface, perhaps at the height of his feud with King Philip, arose another ^{John Peter Oliva.} prophet, or, what was even more authoritative, ^{A.D. 1297.} an interpreter of Scriptural prophecy. John Peter Oliva sent forth, among the severe and fiery Franciscans of Provence, his Comment on the Apocalypse, consentient with, or at least sounding to most ears like, the Eternal Gospel.¹ John Peter Oliva beheld, in the seven seals of that mysterious vision, seven states of the Church:—I. That of her foundation under the Apostles. II. The age of the Martyrs. III. The age of the exposition of the faith, and the confutation of insurgent heresies. IV. That of the Anchorites, who fled into the desert to subdue the flesh, enlightening the Church like the sun and the stars. V. That of the monastic communities, both secular and regular, some severe, some condescending to human infirmity, but holding temporal possessions. VI. The renovation of the true evangelic life, the overthrow of Antichrist, the final conversion of the Jews and Gentiles, the reëdification of the primitive Church. The VII.th was to come: it was to be on earth a wonderful

¹ The opinions of John Peter Oliva are known by the report of an inquisitorial commission, on sixty articles, but the articles are cited in the words of Oliva's commentary. — Baluzii Miscell. i.

and quiet preënjoyment of future glory, as though the heavenly Jerusalem had descended upon the earth; in the other life, the resurrection of the dead, the glorification of the saints, the consummation of all things.¹ The sixth period had dawned, the antiquated Church was to be done away; Christ's law was to be reënacted; his life and crucifixion to be repeated. St. Francis took the place of Christ; he was the Angel of the opening of the sixth seal; he was one with Christ — he was Christ again scourged, Christ again crucified — the image and the form of Christ.² He had the same ineffable sanctity; his glorious stigmata were the wounds of Christ.³ The rule of St. Francis was the true, proper, evangelic rule, observed by Christ himself and by his Apostles.⁴ As Christ rose again, so should the perfect state of Franciscanism rise again. John Peter Oliva asserted the truth of the visions of Abbot Joachim, as interpreted in the famous Introduction; Oliva's exposition of the Apocalypse was but in another form the Everlasting Gospel. The Father in the Law had revealed himself in awe and terror; Christ as the Wisdom of God in the Gospel. In the third age the Holy Ghost was to be as a flame and furnace of divine love; there was to be a kind of revel of delights and spiritual joys, in which there was not only

¹ Article I.

² "In sexto statu rejectâ carnali Ecclesiâ et vetustate prioris sæculi renovabitur Christi lex et vita et crux. Propter quod in ejus initio Franciscus apparuit Christi plagis characterizatus, et Christo totus concrucifixus et configuratus." — IX.

³ In its spirit and much of its language, Oliva anticipated the profane *Liber Conformitatum*.

⁴ "Regulam Minorum per Beatum Franciscum editam esse verè et propriè illam Evangelicam quam Christus seipso servavit et Apostolis imposuit." St. Francis, like the Redeemer, had his twelve apostles. — A. XXII. XXXI.

to be a simple intelligence, but a savor and palpable experience of the truth of the Son — of the power of the Father.¹ Both systems affixed the name of Babylon, the great harlot, the adulteress, to the dominant Church — to that which asserted itself to be the one true Church.² Oliva swept away as corrupt, superfluous, obsolete, the whole sacerdotal polity — Pope, prelates, hierarchy. Their work was done, their doom sealed: these were old things passed away; new things, the one universal rule of St. Francis, was to be the faith of man. As Herod and Pilate had conspired against Christ, so the worldly, luxurious, simoniacal Church arrayed herself against St. Francis. In her drunkenness of wrath, the Church flamed out against spiritual men, but her days were counted, her destiny at hand.

These wild doctrines and wild prophecies mingled in other quarters with other obnoxious opinions, all equally hostile to the great sacerdotal monarchy of Rome, and to the ruling hierarchy. Of all these kindred heresiarchs the strangest in her doctrine and in her fate was Wilhelmina, a Bohemian. She appeared in Milan, and announced her Gospel, a profane and fantastic parody, centring upon herself the great tenet of the Fraticelli, the reign of the Holy Ghost. In her, the daughter, she averred, of Constance Queen of Bohe-

¹ "Ergo in tertio tempore (there were three *Times*, as in the Everlasting Gospel, through seven Periods) Spiritus Sanctus exhibebit se ut flammam et fornacem divini amoris . . . et ut tripudium spiritualium jubilationum et jucunditatum, per quam non solum simplici intelligentiâ, sed etiam gustativâ et palpativâ experienciâ videbitur omnis veritas Sapientiæ Verbi Dei Incarnati et potentiæ Dei Patris."

² The Inquisitors drew this inference and justified it by these quotations: — "In toto isto Tractatu per Babylonem ipse intelligit Ecclesiam Romanam . . . quæ non est meretrix sed virgo." — civ. Conf. vii. xix.

mia, the Holy Ghost was incarnate. Her birth had its annunciation, but the angel Raphael took the place of the angel Gabriel. She was very God and very woman. She came to save Jews, Saracens, false Christians, as the Saviour the true Christians. Her human nature was to die as that of Christ had died. She was to rise again and ascend into heaven. As Christ had left his vicar upon earth, so Wilhelmina left the holy nun, Mayfreda. Mayfreda was to celebrate the mass at her sepulchre, to preach her gospel in the great church at Milan, afterwards at St. Peter's at Rome. She was to be a female Pope, with full papal power to baptize Jews, Saracens, unbelievers. The four Gospels were replaced by four Wilhelminian evangelists. She was to be seen by her disciples, as Christ after his resurrection. Plenary indulgence was to be granted to all who visited the convent of Chiaravalle, as to those who visited the tomb of our Lord: it was to become the great centre of pilgrimage. Her apostles were to have their Judas, to be delivered by him to the Inquisition. But the most strange of all was that Wilhelmina, whether her doctrines were kept secret to the initiate,¹ lived unpersecuted, and died in peace and in the odor of sanctity. She was buried first in the church of St. Peter in Orto; her body was afterwards carried to the convent of Chiaravalle. Monks preached her funeral sermon; the Saint wrought miracles; lamps and wax candles burned in profuse splendor at her altar; she had three annual festivals; her Pope, Mayfreda, celebrated mass. It was not till twenty years after that the orthodoxy of the Milanese clergy

A.D. 1281
to 1301.

¹ Had the assimilation of St. Francis to the Saviour taken off the startling profaneness of this?

awoke in dismay and horror; the wonder-working bones of St. Wilhelmina were dug up and burned; Mayfreda and one Andrea Saramita expiated at the stake the long unregarded blasphemies of their mistress.¹

Nor was this wild woman the only heretic who cheated the unsuspecting wonder of the age into saint worship; there were others whose ^{Pongiluppo of Ferrara} piety and virtues won that homage which was rudely stripped away from the heterodox. Pongiluppo of Ferrara had embraced Waldensian, or possibly Albigensian opinions: he was of the sect known in Bagnola, a Provençal town. He died at Ferrara; he was splendidly buried in the cathedral, and left such fame for holiness that the people crowded round his tomb; his intercessory prayers restored health to the sick; his miracles seemed so authentic that the Canons, the Bishop himself, Albert, a man esteemed almost a saint at Ferrara, solemnly heard the cause, and received the deposition of the witnesses. But the stern Dominican Inquisitors of Ferrara had a keener vision; the sainted Pongiluppo was condemned as an irreclaimable, a relapsed heretic; the Canons were reduced to an humiliating acknowledgment of their infatuation.²

¹ Muratori, Ant. Ital. 70, from the original records. The author of the Annals of Colmar calls her an Englishwoman of extraordinary beauty. — Apud Boehmer, Fontes, i. p. 89. In the process there is no charge of unchastity. Corio, Storia di Milano, p. 159, gives the popular view in which the sect is accused of all the promiscuous license which is the ordinary charge against all secret religions. In the same document, which embraces the process of Wilhelmina, is that of Stephen of Corcorezo, who was accused of favoring heretics, and as concerned in the murder of the Inquisitor, Peter Martyr.

² Muratori adduces other instances of these fraudulent yet successful attempts at obtaining the honors of Saintship. — Ibid.

Of far higher, and therefore more odious name, was Dolcino of Novara, who became the fierce apostle of a new sect, of kindred tenets with the Fraticelli or spiritual Franciscans, with some leaven of the old doctrines of the Patarines (the Puritans) of Lombardy. His was not a community of meek and dreaming enthusiasts, or at the worst of stubborn and patient fanatics; they became a tribe, goaded by persecution to take up arms in their own defence, and only to be suppressed by arms. The patriarch and protomartyr of this sect was Gerard Sagarelli of Parma, then a stronghold of the Spiritualists.

Gerard Sagarelli seemed to aspire to found a new Order more beggarly than the most beggarly of the Franciscans: he had much of the Fraticelli, but either of himself determined or was driven to form a separate community. Pope Innocent had at first rejected St. Francis as a simple half-crazy enthusiast, so the Franciscans drove Sagarelli from their doors as a lunatic idiot. As Francis aspired to the perfect imitation of the Saviour, so Sagarelli to that of the Apostles. He still haunted the inhospitable cloister and church of the Franciscans, which would not receive him as their inmate. A lamp burned day and night within the precincts, which cast its mysterious light on a picture and representation of the Apostles. Sagarelli sat gazing on the holy forms, and thought that the apostle rose within his soul. He determined to put on the dress in which the painter, according to his fancy or according to convention, had arrayed the holy twelve. His wild long hair flowed down his shoulders; his thick beard fell over his breast; he put rude sandals on his bare feet; he wore a tunic and a cloak clasped before,

of the dullest white and of the coarsest sackcloth; he had a cord, like the Franciscans, round his waist. He had some small property, a house in Parma; he sold it, went out into the market-place with his money in a leathern purse, and taking the seat on which the Podestà was accustomed to sit, flung it among the scrambling boys, to show his contempt and utter abandonment of the sordid dross. He was not content to be an apostle; he would surpass St. Francis himself in imitation of their Master, not of his death but of his infancy. He underwent circumcision; he laid himself in a cradle, was wrapped in swaddling-clothes, and, it is said, even received the breast from some wild female believer.¹ In Parma, Sagarelli, though for several years he prayed and preached repentance and beggary in the streets, had a very few followers: in the neighborhood his loud shrill preaching had more success. At length at Faenza, he who had been beheld with contempt or compassion at Parma, became the head of an undisciplined yet organized sect. He found his way back, if not into the city, into the diocese of Parma.

The utmost aim of Sagarelli was the foundation of a new Mendicant brotherhood: for those who had taken the vow of poverty would not endure one poorer than themselves: his followers called themselves the Apostles, or the Apostolic Brethren, or the Perfect. They were but Spiritual Franciscans under a new name.

Obizzo Sanvitale, the Bishop of Parma, was of the Genoese house of Fieschi, nephew of Innocent IV.²

¹ Read Mosheim's account of Sagarelli, *Geschichte des Apostel-Ordens*, in his two volumes of *German Essays*. This Essay is a model of the kind of Dissertation to which later inquirers have added little or nothing. Mosheim doubts, I hardly see why, this last extravagance.

² Obizzo Sanvitale was promoted by Alexander IV., the great patron of

This haughty and turbulent Prelate permitted not the Inquisitors to lord it in his city; the Inquisitors were the victims of popular insurrection. When in the act of burning some hapless heretics they were attacked, dispersed, driven from the city. Parma defied an interdict, and for a time refused to readmit the Inquisitors.

Sagarelli himself had now been preaching above
A. D. 1280. twenty years, either despised as a fanatic or dissembling his more obnoxious opinions. He was summoned before the Bishop, who, in compassion or disdain, not only spared his life, but allowed the beggar of beggars the crumbs from his lordly table. The sect of Sagarelli was no doubt among those unauthorized Orders against which Honorius IV. issued his Bull.

A. D. 1286. Sagarelli was banished from Parma; he returned again, and was thrown into prison; some of his followers were burned. At length, under the Pontificate of Boniface VIII., in the year of jubilee, when Christendom was under its access of passionate devotion, the Inquisition, the Dominican Inquisition, resumed its full power in Parma. Sagarelli was seized; once he abjured, or seemed to abjure, but the remorseless Manfred, the Great Inquisitor, would not lose his prey. That abjuration surrendered him as a relapsed heretic to his irrevocable doom: he was condemned to

Franciscanism, A. D. 1257. In the Baptistery, which he began to build at Parma — “*mirabilis architecturæ, picturis non spernendis exornatus*” — appeared in high honor the genuine likeness of St. Francis. Obizzo was a strong defender of ecclesiastical rights: he laid an interdict on the Prætor (the Podestà?) of Parma. He bore persecutions with a masculine spirit; and defended himself so well against his calumniators, that he was presented by Boniface VIII. (A. D. 1293) to the archiepiscopate of Ravenna. There he died, and was buried in the *Franciscan* convent. — Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, ii. p. 227.

the flames. By one wild account of this terrible scene, in the midst of the fire the voice of the heretic was heard, "Help, Asmodeus." At once the fire went out. Thrice it was rekindled, thrice at that powerful spell it smouldered into harmlessness. Nothing was to be done but to appeal to a more potent name. The Host was brought, the heretic again bound on the pile, again the flames blazed. "Help, Asmodeus," again cried Sagarelli. There was a wailing in the air: "One stronger than ourselves is here." The fire did its terrible work. Such things were believed in those days. No one shuddered with horror at the body of the merciful Saviour being employed on such fearful office.¹

Dolcino, born at a village near Novara, either Prato or Tragantino, caught up the prophet's mantle at the fiery departure of Sagarelli. The Dolcino of Novara. new heresiarch was no humble follower: he had neither the prudence nor the timidity of the elder teacher to disguise or to dissemble his opinions. He was a man cast in an iron mould; not only with that eloquence which carries away a host of hearers with an outburst of passionate attachment and is gone, but that which sinks deep into the souls of men, and works a stern, enduring, death-defying fanaticism. He must have possessed wonderful powers of organization, and, as appeared, by inspiration, extraordinary military skill. Obscurity and mystery perhaps even in his own day hung over the youth and early life of Dolcino. He was said to have sprung from a noble family, the Tornielli; he was not improbably the son of a married Lombard priest. Either before or immediately after

¹ I owe this reference to Jacob ab Aquis, in the recently published *Monumenta Hist. Sabaudie*; to Sign. Mariotti, Dolcino de Novara.

the death of Sagarelli, he was in the Tyrol, and in the diocese of Trent, where lurked no doubt many heirs of the doctrines of Arnold of Brescia: it might be too of the Waldensians and other anti-sacerdotalists. The stern Franciscan Bishop of Trent, Buon Accolti, drove him back to the southern side of the Alps. As the acknowledged head of the Apostolic Brethren, on the death of Sagarelli he was expelled from Milan, from Como, from Brescia, from Bergamo. According to one account he took refuge beyond the Adriatic Sea, among the wild forests of Dalmatia.¹

But he was everywhere present by his doctrines. *His tenets.* His epistles became the Gospel, his prophecies the Korân of the Order. Of his three epistles, which contained the chief part of his doctrines, two still survive. Like the Franciscan Spiritualists, the Apostles of Parma had their periods and eras in the history of mankind. There were four states of man: — I. That of the Patriarchs and Prophets, when not only marriage but polygamy was lawful for the propagation of the human race.² II. That of Christ and his Apostles, who had taught that virginity was better than marriage, poverty than riches, to live without property better than to hold possessions. This period closed with St. Silvester. III. In the third, the evil and iron age, the love of the people began to wax cold towards God and their neighbor: the Church assumed wealth and temporal power. All Popes, from St. Silvester, had been pre-

¹ Mosheim seems not to doubt the residence in Dalmatia. His reasoning is plausible; but on this point alone that severe writer yields, it appears to me, to conjecture.

² Compare Mosheim's very ingenious reading of a passage in the epistle of Dolcino: "In quo statu laudabat bonum fuisse numerum *eum* (*uxorum M.*) causâ multiplicandi genus humanum." — Dissert., p. 246.

varicators and deceivers, except Cœlestine V. The rule of St. Benedict, the life of the monks, had been the saving goodness of that age. When the love of the monks as of the clergy grew cold, virtue and holiness had perished; all were evil, haughty, avaricious, unchaste. St. Francis and St. Dominic had surpassed the rule of St. Benedict and of the monks, but this too was but for a time. The iron age was to come to a terrible end, which was to sweep away Pope, prelates, monks, friars. But, IV. Gerard of Parma began the fourth, the golden age—that of true Apostolic perfection. The Dolcinites too had their Apocalyptic interpretations. The Seven Angels were, of Ephesus, St. Benedict; of Pergamus, Pope Silvester; of Sardis, St. Francis; of Laodicea, St. Dominic; of Smyrna, Gerard of Parma; of Thyatira, Dolcino of Novara; of Philadelphia, the future great and holy Pope.

Against the ruling Popes they were more fearless and denunciatory. The Poppedom was the great harlot of the Revelations. In the late ^{Anti-Papal tenets.} days there were to be four Popes, the first and last good, the second and third bad. The first good Pope was Cœlestine V., whose memory they revered with the zeal of all the idolaters of poverty. The first of the bad was Boniface VIII. The third they did not name: no one could be at a loss for their meaning.¹ As to the fourth, John XXII. had not ascended the throne before Dolcino and most of his partisans had perished; but it would have been impossible to have conceived (nor could the apostles, the successors of Dolcino, conceive) a Pontiff, except from his lowly birth, so opposite to the unworldly, humble, poverty-

¹ Benedict XI. seems to have been passed over.

loving ideal of a Pontiff. According to them, no Pope could give absolution who was not holy as St. Peter; in poverty absolutely without property; in lowliness not exciting wars, persecuting no one, allowing every one to live in freedom of conscience.¹ They were amenable to no Papal censure (from some lingering awe they left to the Pope the power of issuing decrees and appointing to dignities); but no Pope had authority to command them, by excommunication, to abandon the way of perfection, nor could they be summoned before the Inquisition for following after that same perfection.²

The Dolcinites had their strong but peculiar Ghibellinism. Their prophetic hopes rested on the Sicilian House of Arragon. Frederick of Arragon was to enter Rome on the Nativity, in the year 1335 (so positive and particular were they in their vaticinations), to become Emperor, to create nine Kings (or rather, according to the Apocalypse, ten), to put to death the Pope, his prelates, and the monks. The Church was to be reduced to her primitive Apostolic poverty. Dolcino was to be Pope, if then alive, for three years; and then came the Perfect Pope, by special outpouring of the Holy Ghost. It might be Dolcino himself holy as St. Peter, or Gerard of Parma, restored to life. Then Antichrist was to come; the Perfect Pope was to be wrapt for a time to Paradise with Enoch and Elias; after the fall of Antichrist he was to return and convert the whole world to the faith of Christ.

¹ "Non fovendo guerras, nec aliquem persequendo, sed permittendo vivere quemlibet in suâ libertate." — Additament., Hist. Dolcin. apud Muratori.

² Hist. Dolcin. p. 435.

Dolcino and his followers first appear as an organized community in Gattinara and the Val Sesia in A.D. 1304.
 Piedmont. That beautiful region at the foot In the Val de Sesia.
 of the lower Alps, with green upland meadows, shaded by fine chestnut groves, and watered by the clear Sesia and the streams which fall into it, had been but recently possessed by the great Ghibelline family, the Blandrate. To this land believers in these popular tenets flocked from all quarters, from the Alpine valleys, from beyond the Alps. They proclaimed that all duties were to yield to the way of perfection: the bishop might quit his see, the priest his parish, the monk his cloister, the husband his wife, the wife her husband, to join the one true Church. Dolcino in one respect discarded, or (it is doubtful which) boasted himself superior in asceticism to the severity of most of the former sects. Each, like the apostle, had "a sister:" with that sister every one aspired to live in the most unblemished chastity. It is even said, but by their enemies, that they delighted to put that chastity to the most perilous trial. Dolcino had a sister like the rest, the beautiful Margarita, a Tyrolese maiden of a wealthy family, of whom he had become enamored with profane or holy love, when beyond the Alps. By him she was asserted to be a model and miracle of perfect purity: his enemies of course gave out that she was his mistress.¹ At the close of their dark destiny she was taunted as though she were pregnant. "If so," replied the confident followers of Dolcino, and Dolcino

¹ "Secum ducebat Amasiam, nomine Margaretam, quam dicebat se tenere more sororis in Christo, providè et honestè; et quia deprehensa fuit esse gravida, ipse et sui asseverant esse gravidam de Spiritu Sancto." — Additament., p. 459.

himself, "it must be by the Holy Ghost." All this, however, is belied by other and not less unfriendly authorities.¹ But these peaceful sectaries (peaceful, at least, so far as overt acts, if hardly so in their all-leveling doctrines) could not be long left in peace. In all respects but in their denunciation against the hierarchy they were severely orthodox: they accepted the full creed of the Church, and only superadded that tenet. Already, soon after his accession, Clement V., at the solicitation of the clergy and the Guelfs of the neighborhood, had issued his Bull for their total extirpation. Already there were menaces, signs, beginnings of persecution: the Inquisition was in movement. Almost at once the sect became an army. On a mountain called Balnera, or Valnera, in the upper part of the valley of the Sesia, they pitched their camp and built their town. Dolcino himself found hospitable reception with a faithful disciple, a rich land-owner, Milano Sola. They gave out that God might be worshipped as well in the deep forest, on the snowy crag, as in the church.

The first attempt at hostility against them ended in shameful discomfiture. The Podestà of Varallo headed an attack: he was ignominiously defeated, taken, redeemed at a large ransom. Dolcino and his followers (they were now counted by thousands) were masters of the whole rich Val Sesia. But the thunder-clouds

¹ Mosheim justly observes that in the authentic documents there is no charge of licentiousness against the earlier or later apostles; neither in the bulls of Honorius IV. or Nicolas IV., nor in any reports of the trials, more especially the very curious examination at a much later period of Peter of Lugo at Toulouse, in Limborch, *Hist. Inquisitionis*. "Allein die Gerichtsregister, so wohl zu Tholouse, als zu Vercelli sprechen sie von dieser Anklage los, weil sie ihnen keine Unreinigkeit, keine Uebertretung der Gesetze von der Zucht und Keuscheit vorwerfen." — P. 305.

were gathering. No sooner was the Papal Bull proclaimed than the Guelfic nobles met in arms: they took a solemn oath in the church of Scopa to exterminate these proscribed and excommunicated heretics. This formidable league wanted not a formidable captain. The Bishop Rainieri, of the noble and Guelfic family of the Avogadri, now ruled in Vercelli. He set himself at the head of the crusade. Dolcino's followers had become soldiers, Dolcino a general of more than common sagacity and promptitude. He made a bold march along the sharp mountain ridge, and seized a strong position, the bare rock, still called Monte Calvo. The despair of fanaticism is terrible. The con- June 1.

flicts became murderous on both sides. Thrice at least the forces of the Bishop suffered disgraceful defeat. The Bishop saw his whole diocese a desolate waste: even the churches were sacrilegiously despoiled, the images of the Madonnas were mutilated, the holy vessels carried off. They broke the bells and threw down the belfries.¹ But the stronger the position of Dolcino, the greater his weakness. How were thousands to find food on those bleak inhospitable crags? The aggression of their persecutors had made them warriors: it now made them robbers. Society had declared war against them: they declared war against society. Famine knows no laws: it makes laws of its own. They proclaimed their full right of plunder, for without plunder they could not live: all was to them just, except the desertion of their faith.² Frightful tales

¹ St. Mariotti well observes that their hostility to the bells and belfries is intelligible enough. They were rung as a tocsin to rouse the country in case of an attack by the Dolcinites.

² "Item derobare, carcerare et quæcunque mala inferre *Christianis*, potius quam mori et destruere eorum fidem." — Additamenta.

are told of their cruelty in their last wild place of refuge; for they left in the mountain hold, on the bare rock, the weak and defenceless of their body; set off again with the same promptitude and intelligence, over mountain ridges and deep snows, and seized a still stronger height, Mount Zermal, called after them Monte Gazzaro, above Triverio. Here for some months they defied all attack. The Bishop, grown wiser by perpetual discomfiture, was content to blockade all the passes. Starvation grew more intense; the women and the weakly, who had been left on Monte Calvo, found slowly their way to Mount Zermal, and aggravated the distress. The women, if they did not join in the war, urged on the fierce irresistible sallies from their unapproachable mountain hold. They burst at one time on the town of Triverio, and thoroughly sacked it. It was on the prisoners in these expeditions that they wreaked their most merciless vengeance, or rather determined to turn them most relentlessly to their advantage. Gibbets were erected upon the brow of the sheer precipice, on which the inhabitants from below might behold their husbands, brothers, and kindred suspended, and slowly yielding up their lives. It was made known that they might be ransomed for food, or what would purchase food.¹ Redemption at such a price could not be permitted by the inflexible Bishop. Men hunted like wild beasts, became wild beasts; they were reduced to the scantiest, most loathsome food; they ate everything indiscriminately; it is said as an

¹ "*Clam multos alios viros suspenderunt, videntibus uxoribus et parentibus, quia non volebant se redimere ex arbitrio predictorum canum.*" — Hist. Dolcin. p. 437. The ransom of the Podestà of Varallo had been exacted in kind, that is, in means of subsistence.

aggravation during Lent.¹ They had passed the wild dreary winter on these steep, dismal, hungry peaks. They ate rats, hares, dogs, chopped grass, even more horrible food. Numancia or Jerusalem beheld not more frightful banquets than the mountain camp of Dolcino, yet would they not surrender their lives or their faith. Nor was their noble resistance obscure or without its fame. It is difficult not to discern some Ghibelline admiration, perhaps sympathy, in Dante's famous lines,² though Dante, placing the message to Dolcino, "that he provision well his mountain fortress," in the mouth of Mahomet, may seem as it were to disclaim all compassion for the heresiarch. "Unless Dolcino did this he might come before his time to his awful doom." Famine at length did its slow work. The Novarese, or rather the Vercellese, won at length his dear-bought victory. The besieged were worn to thin, feeble, and ghostly shadows. Mount Zerbal was stormed. A thousand were massacred, drowned in their flight in the rivers, or burned. Of the prisoners not one would recant: all perished rather in the flames.³

Capture of
Gazzaro.

Maundy-
Thursday.

Three — Dolcino, Longino, and Margarita — were reserved for a more awful public execution. The Pope

¹ The preceding Lent they had fasted like good churchmen. They had lived on chopped hay, moistened with some kind of fat liquid.

² "Or di a frà Dolcin', dunque che s' armi,
Tu chè forse vedrai il Sole in breve,
S' egli non vuol qui tosto seguitarme.
Le di vivande, chè stretta di neve
Non rechi la vittoria al Noarese,
Ch' altrimenti acquistar non sarà lieve."

Inferno, xxviii. 55, 60.

³ "Atque ipsâ die plures quam mille ex ipsis, tum flammæ, tum flumini submersi, ut præfatur, tum gladiis et morti crudelissimæ dati sunt." — Hist. Dulcini.

was consulted as to their doom. The answer was cold, decisive. "Let them be delivered to the secular arm." Vercelli was to behold the triumph of her Bishop, and the vengeance wreaked on the rebels to the Church. A tall stake was raised on a high and conspicuous mound. Margarita was led forth. Notwithstanding, it is strangely said, her sufferings, exposure, famine, agony, incarceration, such was her beauty that men of rank offered her marriage if she would renounce her errors.¹ She was yet heiress, too, of her great estate in the Tyrol. But whether it was earthly or heavenly love, whether the passionate attachment of the fond consort, or the holy and passionless resolution of the saint, the noble

Death of
Margarita.

woman had nothing of woman's weakness: she endured unfaltering to the end; she endured the being consumed by a slow fire in the sight of Dolcino himself; his calm voice was heard beseeching, admonishing her, as she shivered in the flames, to be faithful to the close. Dolcino was as courageous under his own even more protracted and agonizing trial. He repelled all those who were sent to disturb his last hours with their polemic arguments. He and Longino were placed on a lofty wagon, in which were blazing pans of fire; men with hot pincers tore away their flesh by morsels, and cast them into the fire; then wrenched off their limbs. Once, and once only, as the most sensitive part of man was rent away, he betrayed his anguish by the convulsion of his face. At length, having been thus paraded

Of Longino
and Dolcino.

¹ "Illa vero imbuta doctrinâ ipsius nunquam deseruit mandata illius. Ideo pertinacius in eo fuit firma, in hoc errore, consideratâ sexûs infirmitate. Nam cum mille nobiles quærerent eam in uxorem, tum propter pulchritudinem illius, tum propter ejus pecuniam magnam, nunquam potuit flecti." — Benvenuto. Imola. Muratori, S. R. I. x. 1122.

through the land, both, Longino in Biella, Dolcino in Vercelli were released from their long death.¹

These terrible scenes took place under the rule and by the authority of Clement V. Had John been on the Papal throne he would have even more rudely clashed with the spiritual notion of an unworldly and a poor Pope. Clement V. had been accused of avarice. John XXII. was even more heavily charged with the same vice ; and no Pope plunged more deeply into the political affairs of his time than John XXII. His acts were at once a bitter satire and reproach on his predecessor, and an audacious proclamation of his own rapacity. In the fourth year of his Pontificate, John commenced a process which rent off the last ^{Process about the wealth of Clement V.} veil from the enormous wealth of Clement, and showed at the same time that the new Pope was as keenly set on the accumulation of Papal treasures. Clement, before his death, had deposited a vast amount in money, in gold and silver vessels, robes, books, precious stones and other ornaments, with important instruments and muniments, in the Castle of Mouteil,

¹ The principal authority for this account is the Hist. Dulcini, in the ninth volume of Muratori, S. R. I., with the Additamenta, the author of which professes to have seen and to cite two of Dolcino's epistles. "But," he says, "they kept their doctrines secret, and held the right to deny them before the Inquisition." Dolcino, he avers, had abjured three times. Some circumstances are from Benvenuto da Imola's commentary on Dante. — Muratori, Ant. Ital. v. 6. This passage of my history was written before the publication of Sig. Mariotti's (?) "Dulcino and his Times." Sig. Mariotti (it is not his real name) has the great advantage of perfect local knowledge of the whole scene of Dolcino's career (I had myself, before I thought much of Dolcino, travelled rapidly through part of the district). The work is one of great industry and accuracy, marred somewhat, to my judgment, by Italian prolixity, and some Italian passion. I am indebted to it for some corrections and additions. Sig. Mariotti has demolished, it seems to me, the religious romance of Professor Biagiolini, translated as history by Dr. Krone, "Dulcino und seine Zeit." Leipsic, 1844.

in the Venaissin. The lord of the castle, the Viscount de Lomenie and Altaville, on Clement's death, seized, and, as it was said, appropriated all this treasure. Besides this he had received sums of money due to the deceased Pontiff. The Viscount was summoned to render an account. He and all persons in possession of any part of this property were to pay it into the hands of the Pope's treasurer, under pain of excommunication, and, as to the Viscount, of interdict on his territory. Those in the Court of Rome were to pay in twenty days, those in France in two months, those beyond the Alps in three. The demand against the Viscount was more specific. It amounted, in the whole, to 1,774,800 florins of gold. Of this 300,000 had been destined by Pope Clement to the recovery of the Holy Land; 320,000 to pious uses; 100,000 was a debt of the King of France; 160,000 due from the King of England. The Viscount was a dangerous man. No one ventured to serve the citation: it was fixed on the doors of the church at Avignon. The Viscount at length deigned or thought it prudent to appear before the Court. He acknowledged the trust of 300,000 florins: he was prepared to pay it when the crusade should begin. The baffled Pope, after much unseemly dispute, yielded to a compromise. The Viscount was to pay 150,000: the other moiety was to remain in his hands, on condition that he or his heirs should furnish one thousand men-at-arms whenever the King of France, the King of England, the King of Castile, or the King of Sicily, or the elder son of either, should take the cross. The sum said to have been devoted to pious uses had dwindled to 200,000 florins. The Viscount declared that it had been al-

ready expended, chiefly by others: he was a simple knight, ignorant of money matters. The Pope was manifestly incredulous: he mistrusted the accounts; and no doubt only acquiesced in the acquittal of the Viscount from despair of extorting restitution. He had but shown his own avarice and his weakness.¹

If the sect of Dolcino had been nearly extirpated before the accession of Pope John, the Spiritualists and the Fraticelli, the believers in the prophecies of the Abbot Joachim and John Peter Oliva, ^{The Fraticelli.} swarmed not only in Italy, but the latter especially, in the neighborhood of the Papal Court of Avignon. These sordid and unseemly squabbles for money would not be lost upon them. All these men alike pertinaciously held that the sole perfection of Christianity was absolute poverty, without possession, personal or in common. They wore a peculiar dress, which offended by its strange uncouthness: they cast aside the loose long habit, appeared in short, tight, squalid garments, just sufficient to cover their nakedness.² Even of their dress and of their food—as they immediately put it into their mouths—they had only the use: they declared the birds of the air and the beasts of the field to be their examples. Granaries and cellars were a wicked mistrust of God's providence.

The age was too stern and serious to laugh to scorn, or to treat these crazy tenets with compassion; and they struck too rudely against the power and the interests of the hierarchy, against the Pope himself, for contemptuous indifference. With all this was moulded up

¹ Vit. apud Baluz.

² "Perfectionem evangelicorum Christi in quâdem monstruosâ deformitate, et nihil in futurum reservando a viris evangelicæ professionis vitam ducentibus, esse confingunt." — Baluz. Miscell. ii. 247.

a blind idolatry of St. Francis and of his rule — his rule, which was superior in its purity to the Four Gospels — and an absolute denial of the Papal authority to tamper with or relax that rule. “There were two Churches: ¹ one carnal, overburdened with possessions, overflowing with wealth, polluted with wickedness, over which ruled the Roman Pontiff and the inferior Bishops: one spiritual, frugal, without uncleanness, admirable for its virtue, with poverty for its raiment; it contained only the Spirituals and their associates, and was ruled by men of spiritual life alone.” They had firm confidence in the near approach of the times fore-

General dis-
semination. sure of popularity, possibly among some of the higher orders, assuredly among the wretched serfs, the humbler and oppressed vassals, the peasantry, the artisans of the towns, the mass of the lower classes. Multitudes no doubt took refuge from want, degradation, tyranny, in free and self-righteous mendicancy.² They were spreading everywhere (the followers of Dolcino appeared in Poland), and everywhere they spread they disseminated their doctrines in new forms, each more and more formidable if not fatal to the hierarchy, Fraticellism, Beguinitism, Lollardism. They first familiarized the common mind with the notion that Rome was the Babylon, the great harlot of the Apocalypse.

John XXII. was too sagacious not to foresee the peril; too arrogantly convinced, and too jealous, of his supreme spiritual authority not to

Alarm of
Pope John.

¹ These are the words of the Bull of Pope John. — Raynald. sub ann. 1318.

² See, too, the trial at Toulouse of De Lupo, referred to above.

resent ; too merciless not to extirpate by the most cruel means these slowly-working enemies. Soon after his accession Bull followed Bull equally damnatory. The Franciscan convents in Narbonne and in Beziers were in open revolt from their Order : on them the wrath of the Pope first burst. The Inquisition was committed to Michael di Cesena, still the faithful subject of the Pope, and to seven others.¹ Twenty-five monks were convicted, and sentenced first to degradation, then to perpetual imprisonment. Some at least still defied the persecutor : they committed their defiance to writing. "They had not abandoned the holy Order of St. Francis, but the whited walls, its false brethren ; not its habit, but its robes ; not the faith, but the bark and husk of faith ; not the Church, but the blind synagogue (this was their constant and most galling obloquy : the corrupt Church was to the perfect one as the Jewish Synagogue to that of Christ) ; they had not disclaimed their pastor, but a ravening wolf." For this apostasy, as it was declared, they were brought to the stake and burned at Marseilles.² They were condemned for the heresy of denying the Papal authority. As yet there was no Papal censure of the strict spiritual interpretation of the Franciscan rule : it was the rather established by the Bull of Nicolas IV.

The Inquisition had begun its work : it continued under the ordinary Dominican administration, under which Franciscan heretics were not likely to find indulgence. In Narbonne, in Beziers, in Capestang,

¹ See the letter of John XXII., delegating the inquisitorial power to Michael di Cesena. — Baluzii Miscellanea. Another document contains the sentence of the Inquisition, and to this is appended his signature.

² See, for the frightful details, Vaissette, Hist. de Languedoc, tom. iv.

in Lodeve, in Lunel, in Pezenas, those deniers of the Papal authority, and so of the tenets of the Church (this was their declared crime), suffered, as one party thought, the just doom of their obstinate heresy; as they themselves declared, glorious martyrdom.¹ They were mingled perhaps (persecution is not nice in its discrimination) with men of more odious views, the secret survivors of the old Albigensian or Waldensian tenets. Many of them were believed to be, some may have been really, infected with such opinions. But those that perished at the stake were but few out of the appalling numbers. The prisons of Narbonne and of Carcassonne were crowded with those who were spared the last penalty. Among these was the Friar Deliciosus of Montpellier, a Franciscan, who had boldly withstood the Inquisition, and was immured for life in a dungeon. He it was who declared that if St. Peter and St. Paul should return to earth, the Inquisition would lay hands on them as damnable heretics. At Toulouse the public sermons of the Inquisition took place at intervals, and these sermons were rarely unaccompanied by proofs of their inefficacy. Men who would not be argued into belief must be burned. The corollary of a Christian sermon was a holocaust at the stake.

As yet the great question, the poverty of Christ and his Apostles, had not been awakened from its repose. The Bull of Nicolas IV. was still the law; but John XXII. was proud and confident in his theological learning, and not unwilling to plunge into the perilous controversy. The occasion was forced

Absolute
poverty.

¹ Mosheim had in his possession a martyrology of 113 Spiritual martyrs, from 1318 to the Papacy of Innocent VI.

upon him, but he disdained to elude it: he seized on it without reluctance, perhaps with avidity. He was eager to crush at once a doctrine, the root and groundwork of these revolutionary prophecies of John Peter Oliva, which had recently been asserted, with ^{Ubertino di Casale.} intrepid courage, by an eloquent friar, Ubertino di Casale. Ubertino had not only been persecuted in Provence, he had been excommunicated, and driven out of Tuscany and Parma, where the Spirituals had set up a new General, Henry de Ceva, organized a new Order under provincials, custodes, and guardians, no doubt with the hope that from Sicily was even now to come forth the great king, the deliverer, the destroyer of the carnal and wealthy Church—he under whom was to open the fourth age, and to arise the poor, immaculate, Spiritual Pope.¹

The Archbishop of Narbonne and the Grand Inquisitor, John de Beaune, were sitting in judgment on a Beghard. They summoned to their council all the clergy distinguished for their learning. One of the articles objected against the Beghard was his assertion of the absolute poverty of Christ and his

¹ See the Bull *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*. “*Tam detestabili turbæ præficientes magis idolum quam prælatum.*” This remarkable Bull recounts the five errors of the Spiritual Franciscans:—I. The assertion of the two churches, “*unam carnalem, divitiis pressam, affluentem divitiis, sceleribus maculatam, cui Romanum Præsulem, cæterosque inferiores Prælatos dominari asserunt; aliam spiritualem, frugalitate mundam, vestitu decoram, paupertate succinctam.*” II. The assertion that the acts and Sacraments of the clergy of the carnal church were invalid. III. The unlawfulness of oaths. IV. That the wickedness of the individual priest invalidated the Sacrament. V. That they alone fulfilled the Gospel of Christ. There is a useful collection of all the Bulls relating to this Inquisition at the end of N. Eymeric, *Directorium Inquisitorum*. See for this Bull (dated Avignon, 23d Jan. 1316), p. 58.

Apostles. The Court were about to condemn the
 Berenger de tenet, when Berenger de Talon, only a
 Talon. reader, but a man of character, stood up
 and declared it sound, catholic, and orthodox. He
 would not be put down by clamor; he refused to re-
 tract; he cited the Bull of Pope Nicolas; he appealed
 to the Pope in Avignon. Berenger appeared before
 John XXII. and his Consistory of Cardinals, main-
 tained his doctrine, was seized and put under arrest.
 But as yet the cautious Court proceeded no further
 than to suspend the anathema attached to the Bull of
 Pope Nicolas—the anathema against all who should
 reopen the discussion.¹

The Bull of Pope Nicolas was the great charter of
 Chapter of Franciscanism. The whole Order was in
 Perugia. commotion. A general Chapter was held at
 Perugia. The Chapter declared unanimously that
 they adhered to the determination of the Roman
 Church, and the Bull of Pope Nicolas, that to assert
 the absolute poverty of Christ, the perfect way, was
 not heretical, but sound, catholic, consonant to the
 faith. They appealed not only to the Papal Bull, but
 to a decree of the Council of Vienne. Michael di
 Cesena, the General of the Order, joined in the con-
 demnation: he had signed the warrant making over
 the contumacious brethren to the secular arm at Mar-
 seilles; and now Michael di Cesena defied the Papal
 power, arrayed Pope against Pope, and asserted the
 obnoxious doctrine in the strongest terms. He stood
 not alone: the administrators of the Order in England,

¹ See the Bull De Verborum Significatione. Walsingham says of the
 Statutes of Nicolas IV., quæ faciunt non solum superbire Minores, sed eti-
 am insanire. — P. 53.

Upper Germany, Aquitaine, France, Castile, and six others, affixed their seal to the protest.¹

The Pope kept no measures: he pronounced the Chapter of Perugia guilty of heresy; he issued a new Bull; he exposed the legal fiction, sanctioned by his predecessors, by which the property, the lordship of all the vast possessions of the Order, was in the See of Rome; he taunted them, not without bitterness, with the enormous wealth which they had obtained and actually enjoyed under this fallacy: he withdrew from them the privilege of holding, seeking, extorting, defending, or administering goods in the name of the Roman See. The perilous conclusion followed. It was at least menacingly hinted that the property was still in the original owners: whatever usufruct the Order might have was revocable. The Brother Bonagratia, the fierce opponent of Ubertino di Casale, who had defended the visions of John Peter Oliva, appealed against the Bull; he was thrown into prison.

The controversy raged without restraint. The Cardinals sent in elaborate judgments, most of them adverse to the Chapter of Perugia, some few with a milder condemnation, some almost approving their doctrines. The Dominicans, in the natural course of things, were strong on the opposite party; it was a glorious opportunity for the degradation of their rivals. Under their influence the University of Paris pronounced a prolix, almost an interminable, judgment against the Franciscans.

On the other hand, the most powerful dialectician of the age, William of Ockham, who had already laid at least the foundations of his great sys-

^{Bull of Pope John.}

^{The controversy.}

^{William of Ockham.}

¹ Raynald. sub ann. 1322.

tem of rationalistic philosophy, so adverse to the spirit of the age; and who was about, by severe argument, to assail and to shake the whole fabric of the Papal dominion, employed all his subtile skill in defence of the Spirituals. Michael di Cesena, by a strange syllogism, while he condescended to acknowledge the inferiority of St. Francis to the Redeemer, inferred his superiority to Christ, as Christ was understood and represented by the Church.¹ St. Francis practised absolute voluntary poverty; if Christ did not, he, the type, was inferior to the Saint his antitype. It could not be heretical to assert that St. Francis did not surpass his Example; Christ therefore must have done all or more than St. Francis, and practised still more total poverty. He appealed to the Stigmata as the unanswerable evidence to their complete similitude. All the citations from the Gospels and the Acts, which showed that Christ and his Apostles had the scrip, the purse, the bag (held by Judas²), the sword of Peter, Christ's raiment and undivided robe, were treated as condescensions to human infirmity.³ This language had been authorized by the Bull of Pope Nicolas; and on that distinct irrevocable authority they rested as on a rock. It was clear that the Pope must rescind the deliberate decree of his predecessor. Nor was John the pontiff who would shrink from the strongest display of his authority. He published two more Bulls in suc-

¹ Raynald. sub ann. 1323.

² See note above, p. 27.

³ "Sic Jesus Christus, cujus perfecta sunt opera, in suis actibus viam perfectionis exercuit, quod interdum imperfectorum infirmitatibus condescendens, ut viam perfectionis extolleret, et imperfectorum infirmas semitas non damnaret." This passage refers to the "loculus" of Christ. So speaks the Bull "Excit." vi. Decret. lv. t. xii.

cession. On the grounds of Sacred Scripture and of good sense his arguments were triumphant,¹ but all his subtle ingenuity could not explain away or reconcile his conclusions with the older statute. Nothing remained but to declare his power of annulling the acts of his holy ancestor. That ancestor, by his Bull, had annulled those of Gregory IX., Innocent IV., and Alexander IV.² All those who declared that Christ and his Apostles had no property, only the use of things necessary, were pronounced guilty of damnable heresy. The Franciscans retorted the charge, and publicly arraigned of heresy the Pope himself.

This strange strife, which, if any strife, might seem altogether of words, had a far deeper significance, and led to the gravest political and religious consequences. ^{Effects of the controversy.} Very many of the Franciscans in Italy, who swayed at their will the popular mind, became fierce Ghibellines. They took part, as will appear, with Louis of Bavaria against the Pope. In their ranks was found the Antipope. The religious consequences, if not so immediately and fully traceable, were more extensive and lasting. The controversy commenced by forcing on a severe and intrepid examination of the grounds of the Papal power. The Pope finally triumphed, but the victory shook his throne to the centre. In 1328 Michael di Cesena appeared before the Pontiff at Avignon. He with-

¹ Perfection ought to be content with the *use* of things necessary to life. The Pope argued that the use of things necessary, food and clothes, implied possession.

² "Si enim nobis non licuit contra constitutionem Nicolai IV. predecessoris nostri in quâ se fundant, præcipuè aliquid statuere commune, nec sibi licuit contra statuta Gregor., Innocent. et Alexand., prædictorum, statuere aut aliquid declarare." — Extr. John. tit. xiv.

stood him to the face, in his own words, as Paul did Peter. He was placed under arrest in the full Consistory. He fled to Pisa: there he made a formal appeal to a General Council, accused the Pope of twelve articles of heresy, published a book on the errors of the Pope, and addressed a full argument on those heresies to the Princes and Prelates of Germany.¹ Among other bold assertions he laid down as incontestable, that a Pope who taught or determined anything contrary to the Catholic faith, by that act fell under a sentence of excommunication, condemnation, deprivation.² He called the Pope James of Cahors, as though he were deposed. Among the articles against John was his assertion that Christ, immediately on his Conception, assumed universal temporal dominion;³ and so the high question, the temporal power of the Pope, became a leading topic of the controversy. In a dialogue between one of the Fraticelli and a Catholic,⁴ the Catholic urges all the countless texts about the dominion of Christ, and declares that they must comprehend temporal dominion. His title of King were but a mockery, if it were not over earthly Kings and over States, only over the souls of men. If the Popes did not hold of right temporal possessions, they were damned for holding them. He recounts the most famous of the Pontiffs: "Are these pious and holy

¹ *Tractatus contra errores Papæ apud Goldastum*, ii. 1235, et seq.

² "Unde Papa contra doctrinam fidei Catholicæ docens, sive statuens, in sententiam excommunicationis, damnationis, privationis incidit ipso facto."

³ He quotes against this the hymn of St. Ambrose —

"Non accipit mortalia,
Qui regna dat coelestia."

⁴ *Apud Baluzium, Miscellanea*, t. 2.

men damned?" The Fraticelli urges the infinite scandal of the wars and dissensions excited by the Prelates of the Church for worldly power. "It is marvellous that ye are willing in arms, and, in defence of temporalities, to slay men for whom Christ died on the Cross." "The Prelates," rejoins the Catholic, "intend not to slay men (far be it from them!), but to defend the faith against heretics, and their temporalities against tyrants." The Catholic quotes one of the late Papal edicts. "He (the Pope) alone promulgates law; he alone is absolved from all law. He sits alone in the chair of the blessed St. Peter, not as mere man, but as man and God. . . . His will is law; what he pleases has the force of law."¹

Such avowed principles are those rather of desperate defence than of calmly conscious power; yet to outward show John XXII. retained all his unshaken authority. He issued a Bull, commencing with, "Since that reprobate man, Michael di Cesena." Though the strength of the General of the Order was in Italy, yet even there the Prelates of the Order, who were by family, city connections, or opinions, Guelf, adhered to the Pope. The Imperialists in Germany were with the rebellious General, but in France he was held as a heretic. The more sober and moderate of the Order assembled, deposed him, and chose Bertrand di Torre as the General of the Franciscans.

This spiritual democracy had more profound and enduring workings on the mind and heart of man than the fierce outbreak of social democ-

The Pastoureaux.

¹ Extravagant. de institut. "Ipse solus edit legem, ipse solus a legibus absolutus. Ipse est solus sedens in beati Petri cathedrâ, non tanquam purus homo sed tanquam Deus et homo." — P. 601.

racy which now, during the reign of Philip the Long, again desolated France. As in the days of St. Louis, an insurrection of the peasantry spread from the British Channel to the shores of the Mediterranean. The long unrelenting exactions of Philip the Fair, which had weighed so heavily on the higher orders — where there were middle classes, on them too — increasing in weight as they descended, crushed to the earth the cultivators of the soil. The peasantry were goaded to madness; their madness of course in that age took a religious turn. Again, at the persuasion of a degraded priest and a renegade monk, they declared that it was for them, and them only, to recover the sepulchre of Christ. So utterly hopeless was it that they should conquer a state of freedom, peace, plenty, happiness at home, that they were driven by force to this remote A.D. 1320. object. By a simultaneous movement they left everywhere their unploughed fields, their untended flocks and herds. At first they were unarmed, barefooted, with wallet and pilgrim's staff. They went two by two, preceded by a banner, and begged for food at the gates of abbeys and castles. As they went on and grew in numbers, they seized or forged wild weapons. They were joined by all the wandering ribalds, the outcasts of the law (no small force). Ere they reached Paris they were an army. They had begun to plunder for food. Everywhere, if the authorities had apprehended any of their followers, they broke the prisons. Some had been seized and committed to the jails of Paris. They swarmed into the city, burst open the jail of the Abbey of St. Martin des Champs, forced the stronger Châtelet, hurled the Provost headlong down the stairs, set free the prisoners, encamped and

offered battle in the Prè aux Clercs and the Prè St. Germain to the King's troops. Few soldiers were ready to encounter them. They set off towards Aquitaine. Of their march to the south nothing is known; but in Languedoc they appeared on a sudden to the number of forty thousand.¹ In Languedoc they found victims whom the government, the nobles, and the clergy would willingly have yielded to their pillage, if they could thus have glutted their fury. The Jews of the South of France, notwithstanding persecution, expulsion, were again in numbers and in perilous prosperity. On them burst the zeal of this wild crusade. Five hundred took refuge in the royal Castle ^{Persecution of the Jews.} of Verdun on the Garonne. The royal officers refused to defend them. The shepherds set fire to the lower stories of a lofty tower; the Jews slew each other, having thrown their children to the mercy of their assailants; the infants which escaped were baptized. Everywhere, even in the great cities, Auch, Toulouse, Castel Sarraasin, the Jews were left to be remorselessly massacred, their property pillaged. The Pope himself might behold from the walls of Avignon these wild bands; but in John XXII. there was nothing of St. Bernard. He launched his excommunication, not against the murderers of the inoffensive Jews, but against all who presumed to take the Cross without warrant of the Holy See. Even that same year he published violent Bulls against the poor persecuted Hebrews, and commanded the Bishops to destroy the source of their detestable blasphemies, to burn their Talmuds.² The Pope summoned the Seneschal of

¹ Sismondi says that they were at Albi June 25, at Carcassonne June 29.

² Aug. 1320.

Carcassonne to defend the shores of the Rhone opposite to Avignon : the Seneschal did more terrible service. As the shepherds crowded, on the notion of embarking for the Holy Land, to Aigues Mortes, he cut off at once their advance and their retreat, and left them to perish of want, nakedness, and fever in the pestilential marshes. When they were weakened by their miseries he attacked and hung them without mercy.

The next year witnessed a more cruel persecution, *The Lepers.* that of the Lepers. There can be no more certain gauge of the wretchedness of the lowest classes of society than the prevalence of that foul malady, the offspring of meagre diet, miserable lodging and clothing, physical and moral degradation. The protection and care of this blighted race was among the most beautiful offices of the Church during the Middle Ages.¹ Now in their hour of deeper wretchedness and sufferings, aggravated by the barbarous folly of man, the cold Church was silent, or rather, by her denunciations of witchcraft and hatred of the Jews, countenanced the strange accusations of which the poor *June 24, 1321.* lepers were the victims. King Philip sat in his Parliament at Poitiers. Public representations were made that all the fountains in Aquitaine had been poisoned, or were about to be poisoned, by the Lepers. Many had been burned ; they had confessed their diabolic wickedness, which was to be practised throughout France and Germany. Everywhere they were seized ; confessions were wrung from them. They revealed the plot ; they revealed the authors of the plot ; they were bribed by the Jews, they were bribed by the

¹ See vol. v. p. 257, note 1.

King of Grenada. The ingredients of the poison were named, a wild brewage of everything loathsome and awful; human urine, three kinds of herbs (which they could not describe), with these a consecrated Host reduced to powder. With another it was the head of a serpent, the feet of a toad, the hair of a woman steeped in some black and fetid mixture. Every leper, every one suspected of leprosy, was arrested throughout the realm. Some disputes arose about jurisdiction: they were cut short by a peremptory ordinance of the King to clear the land of the guilty and *superstitious* brood of lepers. They were ordered to be burned, and burned they were in many parts of France. A milder ordinance came too late, that only the guilty should be burned, that the females with child should be permitted to give birth to their miserable offspring. The innocent were shut up for life in lazarets.¹

The inexhaustible Jews furnished new holocausts. The rich alone in Paris were reserved to gorge the royal exchequer with their wealth. The King is said to have obtained from this sanguinary source of revenue the vast sum of 150,000 livres. The mercy of Charles the Fair afterwards allowed all who survived to quit the kingdom on paying a heavy ransom to the royal treasury.²

¹ Continuat. Nangis, p. 78. Histoire de Languedoc, iv. 79. Compare Sismondi, ix. p. 394.

² Continuator Nangis.

CHAPTER VII.

JOHN XXII. LOUIS OF BAVARIA.

IF John XXII. by his avarice offended those who held absolute poverty to be the perfection of Christianity, he was in other respects as far from their conception of a true Pope—one who should be content with spiritual dominion, and withdraw altogether from secular affairs. His whole life was in contemptuous opposition to such doctrines. Of all the Pontiffs—Gregory VII., Innocent III., Boniface VIII.—no one was more deeply involved in temporal affairs, or employed his spiritual weapons, censures, excommunications, interdicts, more prodigally for political ends. His worldliness wanted the dignity of motive which might dazzle or bewilder the strong minds of his predecessors. If he did not advance new pretensions, he promulgated the old in the most naked and offensive form, so as to provoke a controversy, which, however silenced for a time, left its indelible influence on the mind of man.

Louis of
Bavaria.

In his long strife with Louis of Bavaria, no great religious, ecclesiastical, or even Papal interests were concerned. It was no mortal struggle, as for the investitures, for the privileges, or immunities of the hierarchy. Louis of Bavaria was no Henry IV., whose profligate life might seem to justify the severe animosity of the Pope; no Barbarossa aiming

at the servitude of Italy, and of the Pope himself, to the Empire; no Frederick II. enclosing the Pope between the territory of the Empire and the Kingdom of Naples, and suspected at least and accused of designs not against the hierarchy alone, against the faith itself. Louis, for his age, was a virtuous and religious prince, who would have purchased the Pope's friendship by any concessions. Nor was he powerful enough to be formidable. Nothing but the implacable and unprovoked hostility of the Pope goaded him to his descent on Italy, his close alliance with the Ghibellines, his sympathy with the Spiritual Franciscans, his elevation of an Antipope.

If John XXII., as he was publicly accused,¹ avowed the wicked and unchristian doctrine that the animosities of Kings and Princes made a real Pope, a Pope, as he meant, the object of common dread; if on this principle civil war amongst the Princes of Germany was the peace and security of the Church of Rome: never did Pope reign at a more fortunate juncture. On his accession John found the Empire plunged into confusion as inextricable as the most politic or hostile Pontiff could desire. On the sudden death of Henry of Luxemburg a double election followed, of singular doubtfulness and intricacy of title. Of the seven Electors, Louis of Bavaria had three uncontested voices — old Peter Aschpalter, Archbishop of Mentz, who, as heretofore, exacted on behalf of his See an ample price for his suffrage;² Baldwin of Treves, as

¹ Ludovici IV. Appellatio apud Baluzium. Vit. Pap. Avenion. ii. p. 478.

² See in Boehmer (Regesta) the repeated and prodigal grants to the Archbishop of Mentz, less lavish to the Archbishop of Treves. On Jan. 10.

solemnly pledged, and for the same kind of retaining fee; and the Marquis of Brandenburg. The fourth was King Louis of Bohemia. For Frederick, of the great house of Austria, stood the Archbishop of Cologne; Rodolph, Elector Palatine, though brother of the Bavarian; and the Duke of Saxe Wittemberg. With these was Henry of Carinthia, who laid claim to the kingdom and suffrage of Bohemia. Besides this dispute about the Bohemian vote, the Prince of Saxe Lauenberg, on the side of Louis of Bavaria, contested the Saxon suffrage. For part of eight years¹ Pope John had the satisfaction of hearing that the fertile fields of Germany were laid waste, her noble cities burned, the Rhine and her affluents running with the blood of Christian men. He might look on with complacency, admitting neither title, and awaiting the time when he would no longer dissemble his own designs. Even Clement V. had dreaded the union of the two realms of France and the Empire; he had dared secretly to baffle the plans of his tyrant Philip the Fair, to raise a prince of his house to the Imperial throne. Either from subservience, from gratitude, or from some haughty notion that a Pope in Avignon might rule the feeble princes who successively filled the throne of Philip the Fair, John determined to strive for the elevation of the King of France to the Empire. In Italy it was the deliberate policy of Pope John altogether to abrogate the Imperial claims of supremacy or dominion; but this was not conceived in the noble

1315, he pledges Oppenheim, the town and castle, with other places, to Peter Aschpalter, not to the Archbishop. This is not a singular instance.

¹ From the accession of Louis of Bavaria, Oct. 20, 1314, to the battle of Muhldorf, Sept. 28, 1322. John, Pope, 1317.

spirit of an Italian Pontiff, generously resolved, for the independence of Italy, to raise a powerful monarchy in the Peninsula, at the hazard of its obtaining control over the Pope himself. It was as a French Pontiff, ruling in Avignon, as the grateful vassal of his patron Robert of Naples, who had raised him to the Papal throne, and continued to exercise unbounded influence over the mind of John, that the Pope plunged into the politics of Italy. The expedition of Henry of Luxemburg, and the voluntary exile of the ^{Italian} ^{politics.}

Popes, had greatly strengthened the Ghibellines. At their head were the three most powerful of those subtle adventurers who had become Princes, the Visconti in Milan, Can della Scala in Verona, Castruccio in Lucca. Robert of Naples and the Republic of Florence headed the Guelfs. Immediately on his accession Pope John went through the idle form of issuing letters of peace, addressed to all the Princes and cities of Italy. But tempests subside not at the breath of Popes, and John speedily forgot his own lessons. Matteo Visconti ruled as Imperial Vicar, not through that vain title, but by his own power in the north. He was A.D. 1317.

Lord of Milan, Pavia, Piacenza, Novara, Alessandria, Tortona, Como, Lodi, Bergamo, and other territories.¹ The Pope forbade him to bear the title of Imperial Vicar during the abeyance of the Empire. Visconti obeyed, and styled himself Lord of Milan. As yet there was no open hostility; but Genoa had expelled her Ghibelline citizens. The exiles returned at the head of a formidable Lombard force furnished by the Visconti. The city was besieged, reduced to extremity. The Genoese summoned Robert King of Naples

¹ Muratori, *Annali d' Italia*, sub ann. 1320.

to their aid; they made over to him the Seignory of the city; but the new Lord of Genoa could not repel the besieging army, which still pressed on its operations. On the 29th April, 1320, Robert of Naples set out to visit the Pope at Avignon. The fate of Italy was determined in their long and amicable conference. The King had bestowed on John the Pope's son, John would bestow on Robert the Kingdom of Italy. The Cardinal Bertrand de Poyet, as the enemies of the Pope and the Cardinal averred (and they were not men to want enemies), the natural son of the Pope, was sent as the Legate of the Roman See into Lombardy. The Pope, during the vacancy of the Empire (and the Empire, if he had his will, would be long vacant), claimed the administration of the Imperial realm.¹

In the next year King Robert was created, by the Pope's mandate, Vicar of Italy during the
Robert of
Naples Vicar. abeyance of the Empire. The Pope was prepared to maintain his Vicar, to crush the audacious Ghibellines, who had not withdrawn from the siege of Genoa, with all the arms, spiritual as well as temporal, within his power. The Inquisition was commanded to institute a process of heresy against Matteo Visconti and his sons, against Can Grande, against Passerino, Lord of Mantua, against the Marquis of Este, Lord of Ferrara, and all the other heads of the Ghibellines. The Princes protested their zealous orthodoxy: their sole crime was resistance to this new usurpation of the

¹ "De jure est legendum quod vacante imperio . . . ejus jurisdictio, regimen et dispositio ad summum Pontificem devolvantur, cui in personâ B. Petri, cœlestis simul et terreni Imperii jura Deus ipse commisit."—Bull., dated 1317. Compare Planck, v. p. 118.

Pope.¹ But the Pope relied not on his spiritual arms. France was ever ready to furnish gallant Knights and Barons on any adventure, especially where they might adorn their brilliant arms with the Cross. Philip, the son of Charles of Valois, descended the Alps at the head of three thousand men-at-arms; the Guelfs flocked to his standard; he was joined by the Cardinal Legate. But the French Prince, encompassed by the wily Visconti with a larger force, either won by his unexpected and politic courtesy, or, as the Guelfs bitterly declared, over-bribed, at all events glad to extricate himself from his perilous position, retreated beyond the Alps without striking a blow. Still, though Vercelli fell before the conquering Visconti, the Cardinal Legate maintained his haughty tone. He sent to command the Milanese to submit to the Vicar named by the Pope, King Robert of Naples: his messenger, a priest, was thrown into prison.

The next year more formidable preparations were made. A large army was levied and placed under the command of Raymond de Cardona, an experienced General. Frederick of Austria was invited to join the league: his brother Henry came down the Alps, on the German side, with a body of men.

The spiritual battle was waged with equal vigor. A Council was held at Broglio, near Alexan-
 dria. Matteo Visconti was arraigned as a Council of
Broglio.

¹ Good Muratori had before spoken of the immoderate influence of Robert of Naples over the Pope; he proceeds: "Che i Re e Principi della terra facciano guerra, e una pension dura, ma inevitabile di questo misero mondo . . . Ma sempre sarà a desiderare ch'è il sacerdozio, istituto da Dio per bene dell' anima, e per seminar la pace, non entri ad ajutare, e fomentar le ambiziose voglie de' Principi terreni, e molto piu guardi dall' ambizione se stesso." — *Annal.* sub ann. 1320.

profane enemy of the Church, as the impious and cruel perpetrator of all crimes and sins, the ravaging depopulator of Lombardy.¹ He had contumaciously prevented any one from passing his frontier with the Papal Bull of excommunication; he had resisted the Inquisition, and endeavored to rescue a heretic female named Manfredi; he was a necromancer, invoked devils, and took their counsel; he denied the resurrection of the body; for two years he had resisted the Papal monition. He was pronounced to be degraded, deprived of his military belt, incapacitated from holding any civil office, and condemned, with all his posterity, to everlasting infamy.² The land was under an interdict; his estates, and those of all his partisans, declared confiscate; indulgences were freely offered to all who would join the crusade, as against a Saracen. Henry of Austria was received in Brescia with two thousand men-at-arms: the Pope had purchased this support by one hundred thousand golden florins. The Patriarch of Aquileia, at the head of four or five thousand men, did not fear to publish the Bull of excommunication.³ But

Henry of
Austria.

Henry of Austria found that it was not in the interest of a candidate for the Empire to

¹ Feb. 20, 1322. Concilium Brogliense, apud Labbe, 1322.

² "Publicò e confermò tutte le scomuniche e gl' interdetti contra la persona di Matteo Visconti, de' suoi figliuoli e fautori, e delle di lui città, col confisco de' beni, schiavitù delle persone come se si trattasse de' Saraceni. Furono ancora aperti tutti i tesori delle Indulgenze e del perdono de' peccati, a chi prendeva la Croce e l' armi contra di questi pretesi Eretici." — Muratori, sub ann. 1322.

³ Compare Muratori during the years 1319, 1320, 1321, 1323, for the acts of this furious Patriarch, supported by the no less furious Legate, Bertrand de Poggetto (Poyet). Foscolo says, with justice, "Era prete omicida, e federato satellite de quel Cardinal di Poggetto il quale un anno o due dopo la morte di Dante andò a Ravenna a dessotterrare le sue ceneri." — Discorso sul Testò di Dante, pp. 20, 305.

war on the partisans of the Empire. "I come," he said to the Guelfic exiles from Bergamo, "not to crush but to raise those who keep their fealty to the Empire." He refused forty thousand florins for their reinstatement in Bergamo, and retired to Verona. There he was magnificently entertained, received sixty thousand florins from the Ghibelline league, and retired to Germany.

Matteo Visconti was only more assiduous, on account of his excommunication, in visiting churches, by such acts of devotion making public profession of his Catholic faith; but he was seventy-two years old: he died broken down by the weight of affairs, and left June 27. his five sons and their descendants to maintain the power and glory of his house, who were to provoke, from more impartial posterity, a sentence of condemnation for far worse crimes than the heresy imputed to him by Pope John.

The great battle of Muhldorf, between the rival claimants for the Empire, changed the aspect Sept. 28, 1322 of affairs.¹ Louis of Bavaria triumphed. Battle of Muhldorf. His adversary, Frederick of Austria, was his prisoner. He communicated his success to the Pope.² The Pope answered coldly, exhorting him to treat his illustrious captive with humanity, and offering his interposition, as if Louis had won no victory, and the award of the Empire rested with himself.

Louis could not doubt the implacable hostility of the

¹ Compare the account of the battle in Boehmer, *Fontes Rerum Germ.* i. p. 161; and Joannes Victorinus, *ibid.* p. 393.

² There is a strange story in the *Lib. de Duc. Bavarie* (apud Boehmer, *Fontes*), that Louis, after the battle, sent letters of submission to the Pope, which were falsified by his Chancellor, Ulric of Augsburg, as those of Frederick II. had been by Peter de Vineâ. — *Fontes*, i. 142.

Pope, at least his determination not to leave him in quiet and uncontested possession of the Empire. In self-defence he must seek new alliances. As Emperor now, by the judgment, he might suppose, of the God of battles, it was his duty to maintain the rights of the Empire, and those rights comprehended at least the cities of Lombardy. Robert of Naples aimed manifestly, if not undisguisedly, at the kingdom of Italy: it was rumored that he had assumed the title. The

June 13,
1323.

Pope had proclaimed him Vicar of the vacant Empire. The Cardinal Legate was in person combating at the head of the armies which were to subdue all Lombardy to the sway of the Vicar or King. Louis entered into engagements with his Ghibelline subjects. His ambassador, Count Bertholdt de Nyffen,¹ sent an admonition to the Cardinal Legate at Piacenza to commit no further hostilities on the territory of the Empire. The Cardinal replied that he held the territory in his master's name during the vacancy of the Empire; he was astonished that a Catholic prince like Louis of Bavaria should confederate with the heretical Viscontis. Eight hundred men-at-arms arrived at Milan; the city was saved from the besieging army of the Legate and the King of Naples.

The Pope resolved to crush the dangerous league growing up among the Ghibellines. On October 9, 1323, a year after the battle of

Pope institutes a process against Louis.

Muhldorf, he instituted a process at Avignon against Louis of Bavaria. He arraigned Louis of presumption in assuming the title, and usurping the power of the King of the Romans, before the Pope had examined and given judgment on the contested election,

¹ Joannes Victorinus, p. 396.

especially in granting the Marquisate of Brandenburg to his own son. Louis was admonished to lay down all his power, to appear personally before the Court of Avignon within three months, there to receive the Papal sentence. All ecclesiastics, patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, under pain of deprivation and forfeiture of all privileges and feuds which they held of the Church—all secular persons, under pain of excommunication and interdict—were forbidden to render further fealty or allegiance to Louis as King of the Romans; all oaths of fealty were annulled. Louis sent ambassadors to the Court of Avignon, not to contest the jurisdiction of the Pope, but to obtain a prolongation of the period assigned for his appearance. In his apology he took bolder ground. "For ten years he had been King of the Romans; and he declared the interposition now obtruded by the Pope to be an invasion of his rights. To the charge of alliance with the Viscontis he pleaded ignorance of their heretical tenets. He even ventured to retort insinuations of heresy against the Pope, as having sanctioned the betrayal of the secrets of the confessional by the Minorite friars. Finally he appealed to a General Council, at which he declared his intention to be present."¹

Yet once more he strove to soften the inexorable Pope. He had already revoked the title of Imperial Vicar borne by Galeazzo Visconti. His ambassadors presented an humble supplication to the Pope seated on his throne, for the extension of the time for his appearance at Avignon. The answer of John was even more insultingly imperious. "The Duke of Bavaria, contrary to the Pontifical decree, persisted in calling

¹ Dated Nuremberg, Oct. 1323.

himself King of the Romans; not merely was he in league with the Visconti, but had received the homage of the Marquis of Este, who had got possession of Ferrara. They too were heretics, as were all who opposed the Pope. Louis had presumptuously disturbed Robert King of Naples in his office of Vicar of Italy, conferred on him by the Pope."¹

Against the Visconti Pope John urged on his crusade: it was a religious war. The Cardinal Legate was defeated with great loss before Lodi. The Papal General, Raymond de Cardona, was attacked and made prisoner near Vaprio: he was taken to Milan, but made his escape to Monza, afterwards to Avignon. According to one account, Galeazzo Visconti had connived at the flight of Cardona. The General declared at Avignon that it was vain to attempt the subjugation of the Visconti, but that Galeazzo was prepared to hold Milan for himself with fifteen hundred men-at-arms, subject to the Pope.² John would have consented to this compact with the heretical Visconti, but he could not act without the consent of the King of Naples. Robert demanded that the Visconti should join with all their forces to expel the Emperor from Italy. The wily Visconti sought to be master himself, not to create a King in Italy. He broke off abruptly the secret negotiations, and applied himself to strengthen the fortifications and the castle of Milan.

The war was again a fierce crusade against heretical and contumacious enemies of the Pope and of religion. A new anathema was launched against the Visconti, reciting at length all

Capture of
the Papal
General.

Excommu-
nication of
Galeazzo
Visconti.

¹ Raynaldus, Jan. 5, 1324.

² Morigia, l. iii. c. 27. R. I. t. xii. Muratori, Ann. d' Italia, sub ann. 1324.

their heresies, in which, except their obstinate Ghibellinism, it is difficult to detect the heresy. It was asserted that the grandmother of Matteo Visconti and two other females of his house had been burned for that crime. Matteo, now dead, labored under suspicion of having denied the resurrection of the body. Galeazzo was thought to be implicated in this hereditary guilt. The rest of the charges were more likely to be true: acts of atrocious tyranny, sacrileges perpetrated during war, which they had dared to wage against the Legate of the Pope.

The Pope proceeded to the excommunication of Louis of Bavaria. Twice had he issued his process; the two months were passed; Louis had not appeared. On the 21st of March the sentence was promulgated with all its solemn formalities. Excommunication was not all: still severer penalties awaited him if he did not present himself in humility at the footstool of the Papal throne within three weeks. By this Bull all prelates and ecclesiastics were forbidden to render him allegiance as King of the Romans; all cities and commonalties and private persons, though pardoned for their contumacy up to the present time, were under ban for all future acts of fealty; all oaths were annulled. The Bull of excommunication was affixed to the cathedral doors of Avignon, and ordered to be published by the ecclesiastical Electors of Germany.¹

Pope John had yet but partially betrayed his ultimate purpose — no less than to depose Louis of Bavaria, and to transfer the Imperial crown to the King of France. Another son of Philip the Fair, Philip

¹ Shroeck, p. 71. Oehlenschläger, sub ann.

the Long, had died without male issue. Charles the Fair, the last of the unblessed race, had sought, immediately on his accession, a divorce from his adulterous wife, Blanche of Bourbon.¹ The canon law admitted not this cause for the dissolution of the sacrament, but it could be declared null by the arbitrary will of the Pope on the most distant consanguinity between the parties. Yet this marriage had taken place under a Papal dispensation; a new subterfuge must be sought: it was luckily found that Clement V., in his dispensation, had left unnoticed some still more remote spiritual relationship. Charles the Fair was empowered to marry again. His consort was the daughter of the Emperor Henry of Luxemburg. A Papal dispensation removed the objection of as close consanguinity as in the former case — a dispensation easily granted, for the connection, if not suggested by the Pope, singularly agreed with his ambitious policy. It broke the Luxemburg party, the main support of Louis of Bavaria; it carried over the suffrage of the chivalrous but versatile John of Bohemia, son of the Emperor Henry, the brother of the Queen of France. John of Bohemia appeared with his uncle, the Archbishop of Treves, and took part in all the rejoicings at the coronation of his sister in Paris. His son was married, still more to rivet the bond of union, to a French princess; his younger son sent to be educated at the Court of France. Charles the Fair came to Toulouse to preside over the Floral Games: thence he proceeded to Avignon. The Pope, the King of

Pentecost,
1223.

¹ It was reported that Blanche of Bourbon continued her licentious life in her prison in Chateau-Gaillard. She was pregnant by her keeper, or by some one else. — Continuat. Nangis.

France, King Robert of Naples, met to partition out the greater part of Christendom — to France the Empire, to Robert the Kingdom of Italy.

But the avowed determination to wrest the Empire from Germany roused a general opposition ^{Germany} beyond the Rhine. Louis held a Diet, early in the spring, at Frankfort. The proclamation issued from this Diet was in a tone of high defiance.¹ It taunted John, “who called himself the XXII.^d, as the enemy of peace, and as deliberately inflaming war in the Empire for the aggrandizement of the Papacy.” “He had been so blinded by his wickedness as to abuse one of the keys of St. Peter, binding where he should loose, loosening where he should bind. He had condemned as heretics many pious and blameless Catholics, whose only crime was their attachment to the Empire.” “He will not remember that Constantine drew forth the Pope Silvester from a cave in which he lay hid, and in his generous prodigality bestowed all the liberty and honor possessed by the Church. In return, the successor of Silvester seeks by every means to destroy the holy Empire and her true vassals.” The protest examined at great length all the proceedings of the Pope, his disputing the election of Louis at Frankfort by the majority of the Electors and the coronation of Louis at Aix-la-Chapelle; his absolution of the vassals of the Empire from their oaths, “a wicked procurement of perjury! the act not of a Vicar of Christ, but of a cruel and lawless tyrant!” It further denies

¹ The long document may be read in Baluzius, *Vitæ Pap. Aven. i. p. 478, et seq.*; imperfectly in Raynaldus, sub ann. 1324 about April 24. Another protest, in Aventinus, *Annal. Boic.*, and in Goldastus, dated at Ratisbon, Aug. (*Christus Servator Dominus*), is not authentic, according to Oehlenschläger and Boehmer, *Regesta*, p. 42.

the right of the Pope to assume the government of the Empire during a vacancy, as utterly without ground or precedent. Moreover, "the Pope had attacked Christ himself, his ever blessed Mother, and the Holy Apostles, by rejecting the evangelic doctrine of absolute poverty."¹

The last sentence divulged the quarter from which came forth this fearless manifesto. The Spiritual Franciscans were throughout Germany become the staunch allies of the Pope's enemy. Men of the profoundest learning began with intrepid diligence to examine the whole question of the Papal power — men who swayed the populace began to fill their ears with denunciations of Papal ambition, arrogance, wealth. The Dominicans of course, adverse to the Franciscans, tried in vain to stem the torrent; for all the higher clergy, the wealthier monks in Germany, were now united with the barefoot friars. The Pope had but two steadfast adherents, old enemies of Louis, the Bishops of Passau and Strasburg. No one treated the King of the Romans as under excommunication. The Canons of Freisingen refused to receive a Bishop, an adherent of the Pope. The Dominicans at Ratisbon and Landshut closed their churches; the people refused them all alms; they were compelled by hunger to resume their services. Many cities igno-

¹ "Non sufficit in Imperium . . . in ipsum Dominum Jesum Christum Regem Regum, et Dominum Dominorum, Principem Regum terræ, et ejus sanctissimam matrem, quæ ejusdem voti et status cum filio in *observantiâ paupertatis* vixit, et sanctum Apostolorum collegium ipsorum denigrando vitam et actus insurgeret, et in doctrinam evangelicam de paupertate altissimâ . . . quod fundamentum non solum suâ malâ vitâ et a mundi contemptu alienâ conatur evertere et hæretico dogmate, et venenatâ doctrinâ," &c., &c. — P. 494.

miniously expelled those prelates who would publish the Papal Bulls. At Strasburg a priest who attempted to fix it on the doors of the cathedral was thrown into the Rhine. The Dominicans who refused to perform divine service were driven from the city.¹

King Charles of France, trusting in the awe of the Papal excommunications and the ardent promises of the King of Bohemia, advanced in great state to Bar-sur-Aube, where he expected some of the Electors and a great body of the Princes of Germany to appear and lay the Imperial crown at his feet. Leopold of Austria came alone. The German Queen of France had died, in premature childbirth, at Issoudon, on the return of the Court from Avignon.² The connection was dissolved which bound the King of Bohemia to the French interest: on the other side of the Rhine he had become again a German. He wrote to the Pope that he could not consent to despoil the German Princes of their noblest privilege, the election to the Empire. The ecclesiastical Electors stood aloof. Leopold was resolved at any price to revenge himself on Louis of Bavaria, and to rescue his brother Frederick from captivity.³ The King of France advanced thirty thousand marks to enable him to keep up the war. At the same time the Pope issued a fourth process against Louis

¹ Burgandi, Hist. Bavar. ii. 86. /

² She died April, 1324. July 5, Charles married his cousin-german, the daughter of Louis, Count of Evreux. The Pope, in other cases so difficult, shocked the pious by permitting this marriage of cousins-german.

³ See in Albert. Argent. (apud Urstisium) the dealings of Leopold with a famous necromancer, who promised to deliver Frederick from prison. The devil appeared to Frederick as a poor scholar, offering to transport him away in a cloth. Frederick made the sign of the cross, the devil disappeared. Frederick entreated his guards to give him some relics, and to pray that he should not be conjured out of captivity. — P. 123.

of Bavaria : he was cited to appear at Avignon in October. All ecclesiastics who had acknowledged the King were declared under suspension and excommunication ; all laymen under interdict. The Archbishop of Magdeburg was commanded to publish the Bull.¹

On the other hand, at the wedding of Louis of Bavaria with the daughter of William of Holland at Cologne, John of Bohemia and the three ecclesiastical Electors had vouchsafed their presence. In a diet at

Feb. 23, 1324.
Diet of Ratis-
bon.

Ratisbon Louis laid before the States of the Empire his proclamation against the Pope, and his appeal to a General Council. Not one of the States refused its adherence ; the Papal Bulls against the Emperor were rejected, those who dared to publish them banished. The Archbishop of Saltzburg was declared an enemy of the Empire.² Even Leopold of Austria made advances towards reconciliation. He sent the imperial crown and jewels to Louis ; he only urged the release of his brother from captivity.

Louis, infatuated by his success, refused these overtures. But the gold of France began to work. Leopold was soon at the head of a powerful Austrian and German force. Louis was obliged to break up the siege of Burgau and take to flight, with the loss of his camp, munitions, and treasures. The feeble German princes again looked towards France. A great meet-

End of Jan.
1325.
Meeting of
Rhense.

ing was held at Rhense near Coblenz. The Electors of Mentz and Cologne with Leopold of Austria met the ambassadors of the Pope

¹ July 13. Villani, ix. 264. Martene, Anecd. Oehlschlager, Urkundenbuch, xlii. 106. Raynaldi (imperfect). The Pope condemns Louis as the fautor of those heretics, Milano of Lombardy, Marsilio of Padua, John of Ghent.

² Aug. Boehmer seems to doubt the Diet of Ratisbon.

and Charles of France. The election of the King of France to the Empire was proposed, almost carried.¹ Berthold of Bucheck, the commander of the Teutonic Order at Coblenz, rose. He appealed with great eloquence to the German pride. "Would they, to gratify the arbitrary passions of the Pope, inflict eternal disgrace on the German Empire, and elect a foreigner to the throne?" Some attempt was made to compromise the dispute by the election of the King of France only for his life; but the Germans were too keen-sighted and suspicious to fall into this snare.

Louis had learned wisdom; the only safe course was reconciliation with his rival; and Frederick of Austria had pined too long in prison not to accede to any terms of release. Louis visited his captive at Trausnitz: the terms were easily arranged between parties ^{Treaty with} so eager for a treaty. Frederick surrendered ^{Frederick.} all right and title to the Empire; Leopold gave up all which his house had usurped from the Empire; he and his brothers were to swear eternal fealty to Louis, against every one, priest or layman, by name against him who called himself Pope. Certain counts and knights were to guarantee the treaty. Burgau and Reisenberg were to be surrendered to Bavaria; Stephen, son of Louis, was to marry Elizabeth, daughter of Frederick.

The Pope and the Austrian party were alike astounded by this sudden pacification. The Pope at once declared the treaty null and void. Leopold ^{May 4.} rushed to arms. But the high-minded Frederick would not stoop to a breach of faith. He had but to utter his wish, and the Pope had absolved him from all his

¹ Albert. Argentin. Raynald. sub ann. Schmidt. Sismondi, p. 438.

oaths. They were already declared null, as sworn to an excommunicated person, and therefore of no validity. The Pope forbade him to return to prison;¹ but he published letters declaring his surrender of his title to the Empire, admonished his brother to desist from hostilities, and endeavored to reconcile the Pope with Louis. He had sworn to more than he could fulfil: he returned to Munich to offer himself again as a prisoner. There was a strife of generosity; the rivals became the closest friends, ate at the same table, slept in July 80. the same bed.² The Pope wrote to the King of France, expressing his utter astonishment at this strange and incredible German honesty.³

The friends agreed to cancel the former treaty — a new one was made. Both, as one person, were to have equal right and title to the Empire, to be brothers, and each alike King of the Romans and administrator of the Empire. On each alternate day the names of Louis and of Frederick should take precedence in the instruments of state; no weighty affairs were to be determined but by common consent; the great fiefs to be granted, homage received, by both; if one set out for Italy, the other was to rule in Germany. There was to be one common Imperial Judge, one Secretary of State. The seat of government was to change every half or quarter of a year. There were to be two great seals; on that of Louis the name of Frederick, on that of Frederick the name of Louis stood first. The two Princes swore before their confessors

¹ Bull "Ad nostrum." Raynald. sub. ann. Oehlenschläger.

² See the authorities in Schmidt, p. 265.

³ "Familiaritas et amicitia illorum ducum incredibilis." — Raynald. sub. ann. Read Schiller's fine lines, *Deutsche Treue*, Werke, b. ix. p. 199.

to keep their oath: ten great vassals were the witnesses.

This singular treaty was kept secret; as it transpired, all parties, except the Austrian, broke out into dissatisfaction.¹ The Electors declared it an invasion of their rights. The Pope condemned the impiety of Frederick in daring to enter into this intimate association with one under excommunication. Another plan was proposed, that Louis should rule in Italy, Frederick in Germany. This was more perilous to the Pontiff: he wrote to Charles of France to reprove him for his sluggishness and inactivity in the maintenance of his own interests.

The Austrian party under Leopold began to hope that as Louis was proscribed by the inexorable hatred of the Pope, his Holiness would be persuaded to acknowledge Frederick. The Archbishops of Mentz and Cologne, and their brothers the Counts of Bucheck and Virneburg, repaired to Avignon. Duke Albert, the brother of Frederick and of Leopold, urged this conclusion. But the Pope was too deeply pledged by his passions and by his promises to Charles of France: the Austrians obtained only bland and unmeaning words. The death of Leopold of Austria, before the great Diet of the Empire, summoned to Spires, seemed at once to quench the strife. Frederick withdrew from the contest. Louis of Bavaria met the Diet as undisputed Emperor; he even ventured to communicate his determination to descend into Italy, his long-meditated plan of long-provoked vengeance against the Pope. There were some faint murmurs among the ecclesiasti-

Death of
Leopold of
Austria.

Diet of
Spires.

Feb. 28, 1326.

March, 1326.

¹ Villani, ix. c. 34. Schmidt, p. 265.

cal Electors that he was still under the ban of excommunication. "That ban," rejoined Louis, "yourselves have taught me to despise: to the pious and learned Italians it is even more despicable."¹

Louis of Bavaria, now that Germany, if it acknowledged not, yet acquiesced in his kingly title, determined to assert his imperial rights in Italy. The implacable Pope compelled him to seek allies in all quarters, and to carry on the contest wherever he might hope for success. None of the great German feudatories obeyed the summons to attend him. They were bound by their fealty to appear at his coronation in Rome, but that coronation they might think remote and doubtful. The prelates, the ecclesiastical Electors, would hardly accompany one still under excommunication. An embassy to Avignon, demanding that orders should be given for his coronation, was dismissed with silent scorn. But the Ghibelline chieftains eagerly pressed his descent into Italy.² He appeared at a Diet of the great Lombard feudatories at Trent, with few troops and still more scanty munitions of war. He found around him three of the Viscontis, Galeazzo, Marco, Luchino, the Marquises of Este, Rafaello and Obizzo, Passerino Lord of Mantua, Can della Scala Lord of Verona, Vicenza, Feltre, and Belluno. Della Scala had an escort of 600 horse, his body-guard against the

Louis meditates a descent on Italy.

At Trent, Jan., Feb., 1327.

¹ Trithemius, Chron. Hirsch. Boehmer observes, "Weder eine urkunde noch ein gleichzeitiger auf diese Thatsache hindeuten." He therefore rejects the whole. But are not the "urkunde" very imperfectly preserved, and the writers few and uncertain in their notice of events? It is of no great historic consequence. The leading facts are certain.

² Cortesius apud Muratori, R. I. S. xii. 839. Albertus Mussatus, Fontes, p. 172.

Duke of Carinthia, with whom he was contesting Padua. There were ambassadors from Pisa, from the Genoese exiles, from Castruccio of Lucca, and the King of Sicily. All were prodigal in their vows of loyalty, and even prodigal in act.¹ They offered 150,000 florins of gold. The tidings of this supply brought rapidly down considerable bands of German adventurers around the standard of Louis.

Louis relied not on arms alone, nor on the strength and fidelity of the Italian Ghibellines. A ^{War of} war had long been waging; and now his ^{writings.} writings. dauntless and even fanatical champions were prepared to wage that religious war in public opinion to the last extremity. He was accompanied by Marsilio of Padua and by John of Jaudun.² These men had already thrown down the gauntlet to the world in defence of the Imperial against the Papal supremacy.

Marsilio of Padua was neither ecclesiastic nor lawyer; he was the King's physician; but in profound ^{Marsilio of} theological learning as in dialectic skill sur- ^{Padua.} passed by few of his age. Three years before, Marsilio had published his famous work, 'The Defender of Peace.' The title itself was a quiet but severe sarcasm against the Pope; it arraigned him as the irreconcilable enemy of peace. This grave and argumentative work, if to us of inconceivable prolixity (though to that of William of Ockham it is light and rapid reading), advanced and maintained tenets which, if heard for centuries in Christendom, had been heard only from obscure and fanatic heretics, mostly mingled up with wild and obnoxious opinions, or, as in the strife with

¹ "Multis gravis æris dispensis." — Albert. Mussato.

² In Champagne, sometimes erroneously called John of Ghent.

the Lawyers or concerning the memory of Boniface, with fierce personal charges.

The first book discusses with great depth and dialectic subtilty the origin and principles of government. In logic and in thought the author is manifestly a severe Aristotelian. The second establishes the origin, the principles, the limits of the sacerdotal power.¹ Marsilio takes his firm and resolute stand on the sacred Scriptures, or rather on the Gospel; he distinctly repudiates the dominant Old Testament interpretation of the New. The Gospel is the sole authoritative law of Christianity; the rule for the interpretation of those Scriptures rests not with any one priest or college of priests; it requires no less than the assent and sanction of a General Council. These Scriptures gave no coercive power whatever, no secular jurisdiction to the Bishop of Rome, or to any other bishop or priest. The sacerdotal order was instituted to instruct the people in the truths of the Gospel and for the administration of the Sacraments. It is only by usage that the clergy are called the Church, by recent usage the Bishop of Rome and the Cardinals. The true Church is the whole assembly of the faithful. The word "spiritual" has in like manner been usurped by the priesthood; all Christians, as Christians, are spiritual. The third chapter states fairly and fully the scriptural grounds alleged for the sacerdotal and papal preten-

¹ "Mosi legem Deus tradidit observandorum in statu vitæ præsentis, ad contentiones humanas dirimendas, præcepta talium specialiter continentem, et ad hoc proportionaliter se habentem humanæ legis quantum ad aliquam sui partem. Verum hujusmodi præcepta in Evangelicâ lege non tradidit Christus, sed tradita vel tradenda supposuit in humanis legibus, quas observari et principantibus secundum eas omnem animam humanam obedire præcipit, in his saltem quod non adversaretur legi salutis." — P. 215.

sions: they are submitted to calm but rigid examination.¹ The question is not what power was possessed by Christ as God and man, but what he conferred on the apostles, what descended to their successors the bishops and presbyters; what he forbade them to assume; what is meant by the power of the keys. "God alone remits sins, the priest's power is only declaratory." The illustration is the case of the leper in the Gospels healed by Christ, declared healed by the priest.² He admits what is required by the Sacrament of Penance, and some power of commuting the pains of purgatory (this, as well as transubstantiation, he distinctly asserts) for temporal penalties. But eternal damnation is by God alone, for God alone is above ignorance and partial affection, to which all priests, even the Pope, are subject. Crimes for which a man is to be excommunicated are not to be judged by a priest or college of priests, but by the whole body of the faithful.³ The clergy have no coactive power even over heretics, Jews or infidels. Judgment over them is by Christ alone, and in the other world. They are to be punished by the temporal power if they offend against human statutes.⁴ The immunities of the clergy

¹ Innocent's famous similitude of the sun and moon is, I think, alone omitted, no doubt in disdain.

² He has another illustration. The priest is as the jailer, who has no judicial power, though he may open and shut the door of the prison.

³ Universitas Fidelium, p. 208.

⁴ This is remarkable. "Quod si humanâ lege prohibitum fuerit, hæreticum aut aliter infidelem in regione manere, qui talis in ipsâ repertus fuerit, tanquam *legis humanæ transgressor* eâdem pœnâ vel supplicio huic transgressioni eâdem lege statutis, *in hoc sæculo*, debet arceri. Si vero hæreticum aut aliter infidelem commorari fidelibus eâdem provinciâ non fuerit prohibitum humanâ lege, quemadmodum hæreticis et semini Judæorum seu humanis legibus permiasum extitit etiam temporibus Christianorum populorum principum atque pontificum, dico cuiquam non licere hæreticum vel aliter infidelem quenquam judicare vel arcere pœnâ vel supplicio reali aut personali pro statu vitæ præsentis." — P. 217.

from temporal jurisdiction are swept away as irreconcilable with the absolute supremacy of the State. If the clergy were entirely withdrawn from temporal authority, all would rush into the order, especially since Boniface VIII. extended the clerical privilege to those who had the simple tonsure. Poverty with contempt of the world was the perfection taught by Christ and his apostles, and therefore the indelible characteristic of all bishops and priests. Now the clergy accumulate vast wealth, bestow or bequeath it to their heirs, or lavish it on horses, servants, banquets, the vanity and voluptuousness of the world. Marsilio does not, with the rigor of Spiritual Franciscanism, insist on absolute mendicancy: sustenance the clergy might have, and no more; with that they should be content. Tithes are a direct usurpation. The Apostles were all equal; the Saviour is to be believed rather than old tradition, which invested St. Peter in coercive power over the other Apostles. Still more do the Decretals err, that the Bishop of Rome has authority over the temporalities, not only of the clergy, but of emperors and kings. The Bishop of Rome can in no sense be called the successor of St. Peter, first, because no apostle was appointed by the divine law over any peculiar people or land; secondly, because he was at Antioch before Rome. Paul, it is known, was at Rome two years. He, if any one, having taught the Romans, was Bishop of Rome: it cannot be shown from the Scriptures that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, or that he was ever at Rome. It is incredible that if he were at Rome before St. Paul, he should not be mentioned either by St. Paul or by St. Luke in the Acts.¹

¹ It is curious to find this argument so well put in the fourteenth century.

Constantine the Great first emancipated the priesthood from the coercive authority of the temporal prince, and gave some of them dignity and power over other bishops and churches. But the Pope has no power to decree any article of faith as necessary to salvation.¹ The Bull therefore of Boniface VIII. (*Unam Sanctam*) was false and injurious to all mankind beyond all imaginable falsehood.² A General Council alone could decide such questions, and General Councils could only be summoned by the civil sovereigns. The primacy of the Bishop of Rome was no more than this; that having consulted with the clergy on such or on other important matters, he might petition the sovereign to summon a General Council, preside, and with the full assent of the Council draw up and enact laws. As to the coronation of the Emperor at Rome, and the confirmation of his election by the Pope, the first was a ceremony in which the Pope had no more power than the Archbishop of Rheims at the anointing of the Kings of France. The simplicity alone, not to say the pusillanimity, of certain Emperors had permitted the Bishops of Rome to transmute this innocent usage into an arbitrary right of ratifying the election; and so of making the choice of the seven Electors of as little value as that of the meanest of mankind.³

The third book briefly draws forty-one conclusions

¹ The author examines the famous saying ascribed to St. Augustine, "*Ego vero non crederem Evangelio, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas.*" He meant the testimony of the Church (the collective body of Christians) that these writings really proceeded from Apostles and Evangelists.

² "*Cunctis civiliter viventibus præjudicialissimum omnium excogitabile falsorum.*" — P. 258.

³ "*Tantum enim septem tonsores aut lippi possent Romano Regi auctoritatem tribuere.*"

from the long argument. Among these were, — the Decretals of the Popes can inflict no temporal penalty unless ratified by the civil Sovereign ; there is no power of dispensation in marriages ; the temporal power may limit the number of the clergy as of churches ; no canonization can take place but by a General Council ; a General Council may suspend or depose a Bishop of Rome.

The “Defender of Peace” was but one of several writings in the same daring tone. There was a second by Marsilio of Padua on the Translation of the Empire. Another was ascribed, but erroneously, to John of Jaudun, on the nullity of the proceedings of Pope John against Louis of Bavaria. Above all the famous Schoolman, William of Ockham, composed two works (one “in ninety days”) of an enormous prolixity and of an intense subtilty, such as might, according to our notions, have palled on the dialectic passions of the most pugnacious university, or exhausted the patience of the most laborious monk in the most drowsy cloister.¹ But no doubt there were lighter and more inflammatory addresses poured in quick succession into the popular ear by the Spiritual Franciscans, and by all who envied, coveted, hated, or conscientiously believed the wealth of the clergy fatal to their holy office — by all who saw in the Pope a political despot or an Antichrist. At Trent, Louis of Bavaria and his fearless counsellors declared the Pope a heretic, exhibited sixteen articles against him, and spoke of him as James the Priest.

¹ The two, the *Dialogus*, and the *Opus Nonaginta Dierum*, which comprehends the *Compendium Errorum Papæ*, occupy nearly 1000 pages, printed in the very closest type, in *Goldasti Monarchia*, vol. ii. p. 313 to 1235.

So set forth another German Emperor, unwarned, apparently ignorant of all former history, to run the same course as his predecessors — a triumphant passage through Italy, a jubilant reception in Rome, a splendid coronation, the creation of an Antipope; then dissatisfaction, treachery, revolt among his partisans, soon weary of the exactions wrung from them, but which were absolutely necessary to maintain the idle pageant; his German troops wasting away with their own excesses and the uncongenial climate, and cut off by war or fever; an ignominious retreat quickening into flight; the wonder of mankind sinking at once into contempt; the mockery and scoffing joy of his inexorable foes.

From Trent Louis of Bavaria, with six hundred German horse, passed by Bergamo, and arrived Louis in Italy. at Como; from thence, his forces gathering March 15. as he advanced, he entered Milan. March 18. At Pen- March 22. tecost he was crowned in the Church of St. May 17. Ambrose. May 30. The Archbishop of Milan was an exile. Three excommunicated Bishops (Frederico di Maggi of Brescia, Guido Tarlati the turbulent Prelate of Arezzo, and Henry of Trent) set the Iron Crown on the head of the King of the Romans: his wife, Margarita, was crowned with a diadem of gold. At Milan Can della Scala was present with fifteen hundred horse, and most of the mighty Ghibelline chieftains. Galeazzo Visconti was confirmed as Imperial Vicar of Milan, Pavia, Lodi, Vercelli; but hardly two months July 7. had elapsed when Galeazzo was arrested, imprisoned, threatened with the loss of his head, if Monza was not surrendered. The commander of the castle hesitated, but was forced to yield. The cause of this quarrel is not quite certain. The needy Bavarian pressed for the

full payment of the covenanted contribution. Galeazzo, it is said, haughtily replied that the Emperor must wait his time.¹ Galeazzo knew that Milan groaned under his exactions. Two of his own brothers were weary of Galeazzo's tyranny. Louis at once caught at popularity, and released himself from the burden of gratitude, from the degrading position of being his vassal's vassal. The Visconti was therefore cast into prison,² all his proud house were compelled to seek concealment; but it was a fatal blow to the party of Louis. The Ghibelline tyrants had hoped to rule under the name of the Emperor, not to be ruled by him.³ The Guelfs secretly rejoiced: "God is slaying our enemies by our enemies."

Louis having extorted 200,000 florins from Milan and the other cities, advanced unopposed towards
 Aug. 13. At Lucca. Sept. 6. Tuscany. He was received with great pomp by Castruccio of Lucca, but imperial Pisa closed her gates against the ally of her deadly enemy; nor till after she had suffered a long siege was Pisa compelled to her old obedience: she paid heavily for her brief
 At Pisa. Nov. 1. disloyalty.⁴ This was the only resistance encountered by the Bavarian. The Pope meanwhile had
 April 3, 1327. launched in vain, and for a fifth time, his spiritual thunders. For his impious acts at Trent, Louis was declared to have forfeited all the fiefs he held of the Church or of the Empire, especially the Dukedom

¹ Villani. Morigia, Hist. Modoct. R. I. S. t. xxii.

² "Interim Galeaz superbum atque insolentem, ac facere recusantem in altum profundum carcerem detrudi nervoque pedes astringi fecit." — Albert. Mussat. — P. 776.

³ "Animadversio hæc a Ludovico in Vice Comites facta tyrannis cæteris Lombardiæ ingentes terrores incussit." — Ib.

⁴ "E bisognavagli però ch' ella e sua gente erano molto poveri." — Villani.

of Bavaria. He was again cited to appear before the judgment-seat at Avignon, to receive due penalty for his sins ; all Christians were enjoined to withhold every act of obedience from him as ruler.¹ But no Guelfic chieftain, no State or city, stood forward to head the crusade commanded by the Pope. Florence remained aloof, though under the Duke of Calabria ; the proceedings of the Pope against Louis of Bavaria were published by the Cardinal Orsini. Her only act was the burning, by the Inquisitor, of the astrologer, Cecco d'Ascoli, whose wild predictions were said to have fore-shown the descent of the Bavarian and the aggrandizement of Castruccio. Cecco's book, according to the popular statement, ascribed all human events to the irresistible influence of the stars. The stars themselves were subject to the enchantments of malignant spirits. Christ came into the world under that fatal necessity, lived a coward life, and died his inevitable death. Under the same planetary force, Antichrist was to come in gorgeous apparel and great power.²

¹ Apud Martene, p. 471.

² Villani, cxxxix. Compare De Sade, *Vie de Pétrarque*, i. p. 48. He says that there is in the Vatican a MS., "Profetie di Cecco d'Ascoli." I have examined, I will not say read, Cecco's poem, "L'Acerba," half astrology, half natural history, and must subscribe to De Sade's verdict: "S'il n'étoit pas plus sorcier que poëte, comme il y apparence, on lui fit grande injustice en le brûlant." — P. 50. There are, however, some curious passages in which he attacks Dante, not, as Pignotti (v. iii. p. 1) unfairly says, thinking himself a better poet, but reprehending his philosophical doctrines —

"In cio peccasti, fiorentin poeta,
Ponendo che g'li ben della fortuna
Necessitate sieno con lor metâ.

* * * * *
Fortuna non è altro che disposto
Cielo, che dispone cosa animata," &c.

— p. xxxv.; see also lili.

Rome had already sent a peremptory summons to the Pope to return and take up his residence in the sacred city. If he did not obey, they threatened to receive the King of Bavaria. A Court they would have: if not the Pope's, that of the Emperor. The Pope replied with unmeaning promises and solemn admonitions against an impious alliance with the persecutor of the Church.¹ The Romans had no faith in his promises, and despised his counsels. Napoleon Orsini and Stephen Colonna, both in the interests of Robert of Naples, were driven from the city. Sciarra Colonna, a name fatal to Popes, was elected Captain of the people. A large Neapolitan force landed Sept. 23. at Ostia, and broke into the Leonine city. The bell of the Capitol tolled, the city rose, the invaders were repelled with great slaughter.

From Pisa, where he had forced a contribution of Jan. 1828. 200,000 florins, 20,000 from the clergy, Louis Louis advances to Rome. of Bavaria made a winter march over the Maremma to Viterbo. His partisans (Sciarra Colonna, Jacopo Savelli, Tebaldo de St. Eustazio) were masters of the city. To soothe the people they sent ambassadors to demand certain terms. Louis ordered Castruccio, Lord of Lucca, to reply. Castruccio signed to the trumpeters to sound the advance. "This is the answer of my Lord the Emperor." In five days Louis was within the city; there was no opposition; his advent was welcomed, it was said, like that of God.² His march had been swelled by numbers: the city was

¹ Albert. Mussato, p. 173.

² "Populus Romanus ut Deo ab excelsis veniente, gavisus illum magnis alacritatibus, præconiorumque applausibus excepit." — Albert. Mussato, S. R. I. p. 772.

crowded with swarms of the Spiritual Franciscans; with all who took part with their General, Michael di Cesena, against the Pope; with the Fraticelli; with the poorer clergy, who desired to reduce the rest to their own poverty, or who were honestly or hypocritically possessed with the fanaticism of mendicancy. The higher and wealthier, as well of the clergy as of the monastic Orders, and even the Friars, withdrew in fear or disgust before this democratic inroad. The churches were closed, the convents deserted, hardly a bell tolled, the services were scantily performed by schismatic or excommunicated priests.

Yet the procession to the coronation of Louis of Bavaria was as magnificent as of old. The Emperor passed through squadrons of at least ^{Coronation Sunday, Jan. 17.} five thousand horse; the city had decked itself in all its splendor; there was an imposing assemblage of the nobles on the way from St. Maria Maggiore to St. Peter's; but at the coronation the place of the Pope or of delegated Cardinals was ill supplied by the Bishop of Venetia and the Bishop of Aleria, known only as under excommunication. The Count of the Lateran Palace was wanting: Castruccio was invested with that dignity. Castruccio (clad in a crimson vest, embroidered in front with the words, "'Tis he whom God wills," behind, "He will be whatever God wills") was afterwards created, amid loud popular applause, Senator and Imperial Vicar of Rome. Three laws were promulgated: one for the maintenance of the Catholic faith, one on the revenues due to the clergy (a vain attempt to propitiate their favor), one in defence of widows and orphans.

Louis could not pause: he was yet but half avenged

upon his implacable enemy. He was not even secure; so long as John was Pope, he was not Emperor; he was under the ban of excommunication. He had been driven to extremity; there was no extremity to which he must not proceed. He had not satisfied nor paid the price of their attachment to his Mendicant partisans. On the Place before St. Peter's Church was April 18. erected a lofty stage. The Emperor ascended and took his seat on a gorgeous throne: he wore the purple robes, the Imperial crown; in his right hand he bore the golden sceptre, in his left the golden apple. Around him were Prelates, Barons, and armed Knights; the populace filled the vast space. A brother of the Order of the Eremites advanced on the stage, and cried aloud, "Is there any Procurator who will defend the Priest James of Cahors, who calls himself Pope John XXII.?" Thrice he uttered the summons; no answer was made. A learned Abbot of Germany mounted the stage, and made a long sermon in eloquent Latin, on the text, "This is the day of good tidings." The topics were skilfully chosen to work upon the turbulent audience. "The holy Emperor beholding Rome, the head of the world and of the Christian faith, deprived both of her temporal and her spiritual throne, had left his own realm and his young children to restore her dignity. At Rome he had heard that James of Cahors, called Pope John, had determined to change the titles of the Cardinals, and transfer them also to Avignon; that he had proclaimed a crusade against the Roman people: therefore the Syndics of the Roman clergy, and the representatives of the Roman people, had entreated him to proceed against the said James of Cahors as a heretic, and to provide the Church and

people of Rome, as the Emperor Otho had done, with a holy and faithful pastor." He recounted eight heresies of John. Among them, "he had been urged to war against the Saracens: he had replied, 'We have Saracens enough at home.'" He had said that Christ, "whose poverty was among his perfections, held property in common with his disciples." He had declared, contrary to the Gospel, which maintains the rights of Cæsar, and asserts the Pope's kingdom to be purely spiritual, that to him (the Pope) belongs all power, temporal as well as spiritual. For these crimes, therefore, of heresy and treason, the Emperor, by the new law, and by other laws, canon and civil, re-
 moved, deprived, and cashiered the same The Pope deposed.

James of Cahors from his Papal office, leaving to any one who had temporal jurisdiction to execute upon him the penalties of heresy and treason. Henceforth no Prince, Baron, or commonalty was to own him as Pope, under pain of condemnation as fautor of his treason and heresy: half the penalty was to go to the Imperial treasury, half to the Roman people.¹ He, Louis of Bavaria, promised in a few days to provide a good Pope and a good Pastor for the great consolation of the people of Rome and of all Christians.²

But Rome was awed rather than won by this flattery to her pride. Only four days after, an ecclesiastic,

¹ According to the statement of Louis, still more atrocious charges were inserted into this sentence of deposition, by Udalric of Gueldres, the Emperor's secretary. Louis being a rude soldier, ignorant of Latin, knew nothing, as he afterwards declared to Benedict XII., of these things (Raynald. sub ann. 1336). Udalric did this out of secret enmity to the Emperor, to commit him more irretrievably with the Pope. — Mansi, note on Raynaldus, 1328, c. xxxvi.

² Apud Baluzium, ii. p. 523.

James¹ son of Stephen Colonna, appeared before the church of St. Marcellus, and in the presence of one thousand Romans read aloud and at full length the last and most terrible process of Pope John against Louis of Bavaria. He went on to declare that "no Syndicate, representing the clergy of Rome, had addressed Louis; that Syndicate, the priests of St. Peter's, of St. John Lateran, of St. Maria Maggiore, with all the other dignified clergy and abbots, had left Rome for some months, lest they should be contaminated by the presence of persons under excommunication." He continued uninterrupted his long harangue, and then deliberately nailed the Pope's Brief on the doors of the Church of St. Marcellus. The news spread with a deep murmur through the city. Louis sent a troop of horse to seize the daring ecclesiastic; he was gone, the populace had made no attempt to arrest him. He was afterwards rewarded by the Pope with a rich bishopric. The next day a law was published in the presence of the senators and people, that the Pope about to be named, and all future Popes, should be bound to reside, except for three months in the year; in Rome; that he should not depart, unless with the permission of the Roman people, above two days' journey from the city. If summoned to return, and disobedient to the summons, he might be deposed and another chosen in his place.²

¹ He was canon of the Lateran; afterwards the friend of Petrarch. See account of Petrarch's visit to him as Bishop of Lombes.—De Sade, i. 161, &c.

² The condemnation of John XXII. to death, and his capital sentence, are asserted by Raynaldus on unpublished authority. This account is received as authentic by Boehmer, who accepts all that is against Louis and in favor of Pope John. It is more likely a version of Mussato's story of

On Ascension Day the people were again summoned to the Place before St. Peter's Church. May 12.

Louis appeared in all his imperial attire, with many of the lower clergy, monks, and friars. He took his seat upon the throne: the designated Pope, Peter di Corvara, sat by his side under the baldachin. The friar Nicolas di Fabriano preached on the text, "And Peter, turning, said, the angel of the Lord hath appeared and delivered me out of the hand of Herod." The Bavarian was the angel, Pope John was Herod. The Bishop of Venetia came forward, and three times demanded whether they would have the brother Peter for the Pope of Rome. There was a loud acclamation, whether from fear, from contagious excitement, from wonder at the daring of the Emperor, or from genuine joy that they had a humble and a Roman Pope.¹ The Bishop read the Decree. The Emperor rose, put on the finger of the friar the ring of St. Peter, arrayed him in the pall, and saluted him by the name of Nicolas V. With the Pope on his right hand he passed into the church, where Mass was celebrated with the utmost solemnity.

Peter di Corvara was born in the Abruzzi; he belonged to the extreme Franciscan faction; a The Anti-man of that rigid austerity that no charge pope. could be brought against him by his enemies but hypocrisy. The one imputation was, that he had lived in wedlock five years before he put on the habit of St.

his being burned in effigy by the people, rather than confirmed by it. As a grave judicial proceeding it is highly improbable. — Raynald. sub ann.

¹ The people, according to Albert of Mussato, demanded the deposition of John, and the elevation of a new Pope, "novum proponendum Pontificem, qui . . . sacrosanctam ecclesiam Romanam . . . in suâ Româ regat . . . illum Joannem, qui trans montes sacræ Ecclesiæ illudit, anathematiset." — Fontes, p. 175.

Francis. He took the vows without his wife's consent. She had despised the beggarly monk; she claimed restitution of conjugal rights from the wealthy Pontiff.¹ All this perhaps proves the fanatic sincerity of Peter, and the man that was thus put forward by a fanatic party (it is said when designated for the office he fled either from modesty or fear) must have been believed to be a fanatic. Nothing indeed but fanaticism would have given him courage to assume the perilous dignity.

The first act of Nicolas V. was to create seven Cardinals — two deposed bishops, Modena and Venetia, one deposed abbot of St. Ambrogio in Milan, Nicolas di Fabriano, two Roman popular leaders. Louis caused himself to be crowned again by his Supreme Pontiff.

But in Nicolas V. his party hoped, no doubt, to see the apostle of absolute poverty. They saw him and his Cardinals on stately steeds, the gift of the Emperor, with servants, even knights and squires: they heard that they indulged in splendid and costly banquets. The Pope bestowed ecclesiastical privileges and benefices with the lavish hand of his predecessors, it was believed at the time for payments in money.

The contest divided all Christendom. In the remotest parts were wandering friars who denounced the heresy of Pope John, asserted the cause of the Emperor and of his Antipope. In the University of Paris were men of profound thought who held the same views, and whom the ruling powers of the University were constrained to tolerate. The whole of Europe seemed becoming Guelf or Ghibelline. Yet

¹ "Repetiit Pontificem locupletem, quem tot annos spreverat mendicum monachum." — Wading, l. vii. f. 77.

could no contest be more unequal ; that it lasted, proves the vast and all-pervading influence of the Mendicants ;¹ for the whole strength of the Emperor and of the Antipope was in the religious movement of this small section, in the Roman populace and their Ghibelline leaders. The great Ghibelline princes were for themselves alone ; if they maintained their domination over their subject cities, they cared neither for Emperor nor Pope. Against this were arrayed the ancient awe which adhered to the name of the Pope, the Pope himself elected and supported by all the Cardinals, the whole higher clergy, whose wealth hung on the issue, those among the lower clergy (and they were very many) who hated the intrusive Mendicants, the rival Order of the Dominicans, who now, however, were weakened by a schism in which the Pope had mingled, concerning the election and power of the General and Prefects of the Order. Besides these were Robert of Naples, for whom the Pope had hazarded so much, and all the Guelfs of Italy, among them most of the Roman nobles.

The tide which had so rapidly floated up Louis of Bavaria to the height of acknowledged Emperor and the creator of a new Pope, ebbed with still greater rapidity.² He is accused of having wasted precious time and not advanced upon Naples to crush his defenceless rival. But Louis may have known the inefficient state of his own forces and of his own finances. Robert of Naples now took the aggressive: his fleet

¹ See a very striking passage of Albert. Mussato, de Ludov. Bavar.; *Murator*, x. p. 775; *Fontes*, p. 77.

² "Ipse Cæsar segnis tanto tempore stetit, otiosus in urbe, quod quasi omnia expendebat." In one expedition he destroyed the castle in which Conradin was beheaded. — Albert. Argentin. p. 124.

besieged Ostia ; his troops lined the frontier and cut off the supplies on which Rome partly depended for subsistence. The Emperor's military movements were uncertain and desultory ; when he did move, he was in danger of starvation. The Antipope, to be of any use, ought to have combined the adored sanctity of Cœlestine V. with the vigor and audacity of Boniface VIII. The Romans, always ready to pour forth shouting crowds into the tapestried streets to the coronation of an Emperor, or the inauguration of a Pope, had now had their pageant. Their pride had quaffed its draught : languor ever follows intoxication. They began to oscillate back to their old attachments or to indifference. The excesses of the German soldiers violated their houses, scarcity raised their markets. If the Pope might now, compulsorily, take pride in his poverty (and the loss of the wealth which flowed to Rome under former Pontiffs was not the least cause of the unpopularity of the Avignonese Popes), yet the Emperor's state, the Emperor's forces must be maintained. And how maintained, but by exactions intolerable, or which they would no longer tolerate ? The acts of the new government were not such as would propitiate their enemies. Two men, in the absence of the Emperor, were burned for denying Peter of Corvara to be the lawful Pope.¹ A straw effigy of Pope John was publicly burned, a puerile vengeance which might be supposed significant of some darker menace.²

On the 4th of August, not four months after his coronation, the Emperor turned his back on Rome, which he could no longer hold. On the following night came the Cardinal Berthold and

Louis abandoned Rome.

¹ Villani, c. lxxiv.

² Mussato.

Stephen Colonna ; on the 8th, Napoleon Orsini took possession of the city. The churches were reopened ; all the privileges granted by the Emperor and the Antipope annulled ; their scanty archives, all their Bulls and state papers burned : the bodies of the German soldiers dug up out of their graves and cast into the Tiber. Sciarra Colonna and his adherents took flight, carrying away all the plunder which they could seize.

Louis of Bavaria retired to Viterbo ; he was accompanied by the Pope, whose pontificate, by his The Antipope in Viterbo. own law, depended on his residence in Rome. Oct. 1.

He is charged with having robbed the church of St. Fortunatus even of its lamps — the apostle of absolute poverty ! Worse than this, he threatened all who should adhere to his adversary not merely with excommunication, but with the stake. He would employ against them the remedy of burning, and so of severing them from the body of the faithful.¹

Pope John, meantime, at Avignon, having exhausted his spiritual thunders, had recourse to means of defence seemingly more consistent with the successor of Christ's Apostles. He commanded intercessory supplications to be offered in all churches : at Avignon forms of prayer in the most earnest and solemn language were used, entreating God's blessing on the Church, his malediction on her contumacious enemies. His prayers might seem to be accepted. The more powerful of the Ghibelline chieftains came to a disastrous end. Passerino, the crafty tyrant of Mantua, was surprised by a conspiracy of the Gonzaga, instigated by Can della Scala, and slain ; his son was cast alive to perish in a tower, into which Passerino had thrown the victims of his

¹ "Aduotionis et præcisionis remedium." — Apud Raynaldum, c. lii.

own vengeance. The excommunicated Bishop of Forlì died by a terrible death ; Galeazzo Visconti, so lately Lord of Milan and of seven other great cities, died in poverty, a mercenary soldier in the army of Castruccio. Castruccio himself, if, as is extremely doubtful, Louis Sept. 8. could have depended on his fidelity (for Castruccio, Master of Pisa, was negotiating with Florence), seemingly his most powerful support, died of a fever.¹

Pisa, of which Castruccio had become Lord, and Sept. 21. which the Emperor scrupled not to wrest Louis at Pisa. from his sons (Castruccio's dying admonition to them had been to make haste and secure that city), became the head-quarters of Louis and his Antipope. Nicolas V. continued to issue his edicts anathematizing the so-called Pope, inveighing against the deposed James of Cahors, against Robert of Naples and the Florentines. But the thunders of an acknowledged Pope made no deep impression on the Italians : those of so questionable a Pontiff were heard with utter apathy. The Ghibellines were already weary of an Emperor whose only Imperial power seemed to be to levy onerous taxes upon them, with none of gratifying their vengeance on the Guelfs. Gradually they fell off. The Marquises of Este made their peace with the Pope. Azzo, the son of Galeazzo Visconti, having purchased his release from the Court of the Emperor at the price of 60,000 florins,² returned to Milan as Imperial Vicar ; but before long the Visconti began to enter into secret correspondence with Avignon ; they submitted to the humiliation of being absolved, on their

¹ Alberto Mussato, in Ludov. Bavar. Villani, lxxxv.

² 125,000. Villani, x. c. 117.

penitence, from the crime of heresy, and of receiving back their dignity as a grant from the Pope.¹ The Pope appointed John Visconti Cardinal and Legate in Lombardy.

The Emperor's own German troops, unpaid and unfed, broke away from the camp to live at free quarters wherever they could. The only allies who joined the Court at Pisa were Michael di Cesena, the contumacious General of the Franciscans, and his numerous followers. Pope John had attempted to propitiate this party by the wise measure of canonizing Cœlestine V.; but the breach was irreparable between fanatics who held absolute poverty to be the perfection of Christianity, and a Pope whose coffers were already bursting with that mass of gold which on his death astonished the world.

The Emperor, summoned by the threatening state of affairs in Lombardy, broke up his Court at Pisa, and marched his army to Pavia, ^{Defection of Italy.} there to linger for some inglorious months. No sooner was he gone than Ghibelline Pisa rose in tumult, and expelled the pseudo-Pontiff with his officers from their city. They afterwards made a merit with Pope John that they would have seized and delivered him up, but from their fear of the Imperial garrison. A short time elapsed: they had courage to compel the garrison to abandon the city. They sent ambassadors to make their peace with the Pope. Most of the Lombard cities had either set or followed the example of defection. Rumors spread abroad of the death of Frederick of Austria, the friendly rival of the Bavarian for the Empire. Some more formidable claimant might

¹ See in Raynaldus the form of absolution, 1323, c. lv. and lvi.

obtain suffrages among those who still persisted in asserting the Empire to be vacant. Louis retired to Trent, and forever abandoned his short-lived kingdom of Italy.¹

Death seemed to conspire with Fortune to remove the enemies of the Pope.² Sciarra Colonna died; Silvester Galta, the Ghibelline tyrant of Viterbo, died; at length Can della Scala was cut off in his power and magnificence. A more wretched and humiliating fate awaited the Antipope. On the revolt of Pisa from the Imperial interests he had fled to a castle of Count Boniface, Doneratico, about thirty-five miles distant. The castle being threatened by the Florentines, he stole back, and lay hid in the Pisan palace of the same nobleman. Pope John addressed a letter to "his dear brother," the Count, urging him to surrender the child of hell, the pupil of malediction. Peter himself wrote supplicatory letters, throwing himself on the mercy of the Pope. The Count, with honor and courage, stipulated for the life and even for the absolution of the proscribed outlaw. The Archbishop of Pisa was commissioned to receive the recantation, the admission of all his atrocious crimes, and to remove the spiritual censures. In the Cathedral of Pisa, where he had sat in state as the successor of St. Peter, the Antipope now abjured his usurped Popedom, and condemned all his own heretical and impious acts. He was then placed on board a galley, and conveyed to Avignon. In every city in Provence through which he passed he was con-

Fate of the
Antipope.

Aug. 4.

¹ He seems to have reached Trent by Dec. 24 (1329), before the actual death of Frederick of Austria. — Boehmer, *Regesta*.

² Raynaldus, 1329, xix. Villani, x. 139.

dennded to hear the public recital of all his iniquities. The day after his arrival at Avignon he was Aug. 24. introduced into the full Consistory with a halter round his neck : he threw himself at the Pope's feet, imploring mercy, and execrating his own impiety. Nothing more was done on that day, for the clamor and the multitude, before which the awe-struck man stood mute. A fortnight after, to give time for a full and Sept. 6. elaborate statement of all his offences, he appeared again, and read his long self-abasing confession. No words were spared which could aggravate his guilt or deepen his humiliation. He foreswore and condemned all the acts of the heretical and schismatic Louis of Bavaria, the heresies and errors of Michael di Cesena, the blasphemies of Marsilio of Padua and John of Jaudun. Pope John wept, and embraced as a father his prodigal son. Peter di Corvara was kept in honorable imprisonment in the Papal palace, closely watched and secluded from intercourse with the world, but allowed the use of books and all the services of the Church. He lived about three years and a half, and died a short time before his triumphant rival.¹

Louis of Bavaria, now in undisturbed possession of the Empire by the death of Frederick of Austria (the Pope had in vain sought a new antagonist among the German princes), weary of the strife, dispirited by his Italian discomfiture, still under excommunication, though the excommunication was altogether disregarded by the ecclesiastics as well as by the lay nobles of Germany, was prepared to obtain ^{Reconciliation proposed.} at any sacrifice the recognition of his title.

¹ Read the Confession of the Antipope, — Apud Baluzium, vol. ii. p. 145.

Baldwin, Archbishop of Treves, and the King of Bohemia, undertook the office of mediation. They proposed terms so humiliating as might have satisfied any one but a Pope like John XXII. Louis would renounce the Antipope, revoke his appeal to a General Council, rescind all acts hostile to the Church, acknowledge the justice of his excommunication. The one concession was that he should remain Emperor. The Pope replied at length, and with contemptuous severity.¹ The books of Marsilio of Padua and John of Jaudun had made too deep a wound: it was still rankling in his heart. Nor these alone — Michael di Cesena, Bonagratia, William of Ockham, had fled to Germany: they had been received with respect. The Pope examines and scornfully rejects all the propositions: — “The Bavarian will renounce the Antipope after the Antipope has deposed himself, and sought the mercy of the Pope. He will revoke his appeal, but what right of appeal has an excommunicated heretic? He will rescind his acts, but what atonement will he make for those acts? He will acknowledge the justice of his excommunication, but what satisfaction does he offer? — what proof of penitence? By what title would he be Emperor? — his old one, which has been so often annulled by the Pope? — by some new title? — he, an impious, sacrilegious, heretical tyrant?” July 31, 1330. The King of Bohemia is then exhorted to take immediate steps for the election of a lawful Emperor.

But Louis of Bavaria continued to bear the title and to exercise at least some of the functions of Emperor. Once indeed he proposed to abdicate in favor of his

¹ Martene, *Thesaurus*, ii. 800.

son, but the negotiation came to no end. The restless ambition of John of Bohemia was engaged in an adventurous expedition into Italy, where to the Guelfs he declared that his arms were sanctioned by the Pope — to the Ghibellines, that he came to reëstablish the rights of the Empire.

The Pope was more vigorous, if not more successful, in the suppression of the spiritual rebels against his power. The more turbulent and obstinate of the Franciscan Order were spread throughout Christendom, from England to Sicily. The Queen of Sicily was suspected of favoring their tenets. Wherever they were, John pursued them with his persecuting edicts. The Inquisition was instructed to search them out in their remotest sanctuaries; the clergy were directed to denounce them on every Sunday and on every festival.

On a sudden it was bruited abroad that the Pope himself had fallen into heresy on a totally different point. John XXII. was proud of ^{Heresy of the Pope.} his theologic learning; he had indulged, and in public, in perilous speculations; he had advanced the tenet, that till the day of Judgment the Saints did not enjoy the beatific vision of God. At his own Court some of the Cardinals opposed him with polemic vehemence. The more absolutely the question was beyond the boundary of human knowledge and revealed truth, the more positive and obstinate were the disputants. The enemies of the Pope — those who already held him to be a heretic on account of his rejection of absolute poverty — raised and propagated the cry with zealous activity. It was either his assertion, or an inference from his doctrines, that the Apostles, that John and

Peter, even the Blessed Virgin herself, only contemplated the humanity of Christ, and beheld not his God-head.¹

About the same time jealousies had begun to grow up between the Pope and the Court of France. A new race, that of Valois, was now on the throne. The Pope, while from his residence at Avignon he might appear the vassal, in fact had become the master of his Sovereign. He ruled by a kind of ostentatious parental authority, by sympathy with all their superstitions, and by fostering their ambition, as soaring to the Imperial crown. Philip of Valois aspired to the character of a chivalrous monarch. He declared his determination to organize a vast crusade, first against the Moors in Spain: his aims extended to the conquest of Syria. But the days Philip de Valois King of France. Crusade. were past when men were content with the barren glory of combating for the Cross, when the high religious impulse was the inspiration of valor, the love of Christ with the hope of heaven the sole motive and the sole reward. Philip was no St. Louis. There was more worldly wisdom, more worldly interest, in his plan. He submitted certain propositions to the Pope as the terms on which he would condescend to engage in holy warfare for the Cross: — The absolute disposal of all the vast wealth in the Papal treasury, laid up, as always had been said, for this sacred purpose; the tenths of all Christendom for ten years; the appointment to all the benefices in his realm for three years; the reërection of the kingdom of Arles in favor of his son; the kingdom of Italy for his brother, Charles Count of Alençon.² The Pope and the Car-

¹ Villani. That, no doubt, was the popular view of the doctrine.

² Raynaldus, sub ann. 1332.

dinals stood aghast at these demands. The avaricious Pope to surrender all his treasures ! — A new kingdom to be formed which might incorporate Avignon within its limits ! They returned a cold answer, with vague promises of spiritual and temporal aid when the king of France should embark on the crusade.

This menaced invasion of his treasury, and the design of creating a formidable kingdom at his ^{Cardinal} Legate at Bologna, caused grave apprehensions to the Pope. He had no inclination to sink, like his predecessor, into a tame vassal of the King of France. He began, if not seriously to meditate, to threaten and to prepare, a retreat into Italy, not indeed to Rome. Rome's humble submission had not effaced the crimes of the coronation of the Bavarian, and the inauguration of the Antipope ; and Rome was insecure from the raging feuds of the Orsinis and the Colonnas. The Cardinal Legate, Poyet, the reputed son or nephew of the Pope, after a succession of military adventures and political intrigues, was now master of Bologna. He was Count of Romagna, Marquis of the March of Ancona. He announced the gracious intention of the Pope to honor that city with his residence. He began to clear a vast space, to raze many houses of the citizens, in order to build a palace for the Pope's reception ; but this palace had more the look of a strong citadel, to awe and keep in submission the turbulent Bolognese.

Meanwhile the King of France seemed still intent on the crusade. He had rapidly come down in his demands. He would be content with the grant of the tenths throughout his realm for six years. But the rest of Christendom was not to escape this sacred tax : the tenths were to be levied for the Pope during the

same period. The King solemnly pledged himself to embark in three years for Syria ; but he stipulated that if prevented by any impediment, the validity of his excuse was to be judged not by the Pope, but by two Prelates of France designated for that office.

Yet even the stir of preparation for the crusade, somewhat abated by menacing signs of war between France and England, was absorbed not only among the clergy, but among the laity also, by the discussions concerning the Beatific Vision, which rose again into engrossing importance. The tenet had become a passion with the Pope. He had given instructions to the Cardinals, Bishops, and all learned theologians, to examine it with the most reverent attention ; but benefices and preferments were showered on those who inclined to his own opinions — the rest were rewarded with coldness and neglect. The Pope himself collected a chain of citations from the Scriptures and the Fathers, in which, without absolutely determining the question, he betrayed his own views with sufficient distinctness. Paris became the centre of these disputes. The Pope was eager to obtain the support of the University, in theology, as in all other branches of erudition, of the highest authority. The General of the Franciscans, Gerald Otho, a fellow-countryman of the Pope, and advanced by his favor to that high rank on the degradation of Michael di Cesena, was zealous to display his gratitude. He preached in public, denying the Beatific Vision till the day of Judgment. The University and the Dominicans, actuated by their hostility to the Franciscans, declared the authority of their own irrefragable Thomas Aquinas impeached. They broke out in indignant repudiation of such heretical

conclusions. The King rushed into the contest: he declared that his realm should not be polluted with heresy; he threatened to burn the Franciscan as a Paterin; he uttered even a more opprobrious name; he declared that not even the Pope should disseminate such odious doctrines in France. "If the Saints behold not the Godhead, of what value was their intercession? Why address to them useless prayers?" The preacher fled in all haste; with equal haste came the watchful Michael di Cesena to Paris, to inflame and keep alive the ultra-Papal orthodoxy of King Philip.

The King of France and the King of Naples were estranged too by the doubtful conduct of the Pope towards the King of Bohemia. The double-minded Pontiff was protesting to the Florentines that he had given no sanction to, and disclaimed aloud all connection with the invasion of Italy by the Bohemian; but, as was well known, John of Bohemia was too useful an ally against Louis of Bavaria for the Pope to break with him; and the Cardinal Legate, Bernard de Poyet, was in close alliance with the Bohemian.¹

The Kings spoke the language of strong remonstrance; the greater part of the Cardinals admitted, with sorrow, the heterodoxy of the Pope. His adversaries, all over Christendom, denounced his grievous departure from holy truth. Bonagratia, the Franciscan, wrote to confute his awful errors. Even John XXII. began to quail: he took refuge in the cautious ambiguity with which he had promul-
The Pope
alarmed.
 gated his opinions. He sought only truth; he had

¹ Compare the curious autobiographical account of this expedition by Charles, the son of John of Bohemia, afterwards the Emperor Charles IV. — Bohmer, *Fontes*, i. pp. 228, 270.

not positively determined or defined this profound question.

But the time was now approaching, when, if a Pontiff so worldly and avaricious might be admitted among the Saints, he would know the solution of that unrevealed secret. John XXII. was now near ninety years old: the last year of his life was not the least busy and A.D. 1334. unquiet. The Greeks, through succors from the Pope and the King of Naples, had obtained some naval advantages over the Turks; but the Cardinal Legate, expelled from Bologna, either fled for refuge or was unwilling to be absent, if not from the death-bed of his parent, from the conclave which should elect his successor. Against Louis of Bavaria, though in the hope of his surrender of the Empire to his brother Pope John had taken a milder tone, he now resumed all his immitigable rigor: on the condition of the unqualified surrender of the Empire, and that alone, could Louis be admitted into the bosom of the Church. The Pope had continued to urge the suppression of the Fraticelli by the stake. But his theological hardihood forsook him.¹ He published on his death-bed what his enemies called a lukewarm recantation,² but a recantation which might have satisfied less jealous polemics. He had no intention to infringe on the decrees of the Church. All he had preached or disputed he humbly submitted to the judgment of the Church and of his successors.³

But if the doctrinal orthodoxy of John XXII. was thus rescued from obloquy, the discovery of the enor-

¹ Raynald. sub ann.

² "Tepidam recantationem." — Minorita apud Eccard.

³ Villani. This was dated Dec. 3. He died Dec. 4.

mous treasures accumulated during his Pontificate must have shaken the faith even of those who repudiated the extreme views of Apostolic poverty. The brother of Villani the historian, a banker, was ordered to take the inventory. It amounted to eighteen millions of gold florins in specie, seven millions in plate and jewels. "The good man," observes the historian, "had forgotten that saying, 'Lay not up your treasures upon earth;' but perhaps I have said more than enough.—perhaps he intended this wealth for the recovery of the Holy Land."¹ This was beyond and above the lavish expenditure on the Italian wars, the maintenance of his martial son or nephew, the Cardinal Legate, at the head of a great army, and his profuse provision for other relatives.² One large source of his wealth was notorious to Christendom. Under the pretext of discouraging simony, he seized into his own power all the

¹ "He loved our city," says Villani, "when we were obedient to the Legate; when not so, he was our enemy."

² A large portion of this revenue rose from the system of reservations, carried to its height by John XXII. He began this early. "Joannes XXII., Pontificatus sui anno primo reservavit suæ et Sedis Apostolicæ collationi, omnia beneficia ecclesiastica, quæ fuerunt et quocunque nomine censeantur, ubicunque ea vacare contigerit per acceptionem alterius beneficii, prætextu gratiæ ab eodem D. Papæ factæ vel faciendæ acceptata, mihiq; Gaucelmo Vicecancellario suo præcepit . . . quod hæc redigerem in scripturam." — Baluz. Vit. P. Avin. i. p. 722. Those vacancies were extended to other cases. He amplified in the same manner the Papal provisions. "That all these graces would be sold, and that this was the object of their enactment, was as little a secret as the wealth they brought into the Papal treasury." — Eichhorn, *Deutsche Recht*, i. ii. p. 507. This is truly said. John, by a Bull under the specious pretext of annulling the execrable usage of pluralities (the Bull is entitled *Execrabilis*), commanded all pluralists to choose one, and one only, of their benefices (the Cardinals were excepted), and to surrender the rest, to which the Pope was to appoint, as reserves. "Quæ omnia et singula beneficia vacatura, ut præmittitur, vel dimissa, nostræ et Sedis Apostolicæ dispositioni reservamus, inhibentes ne quis præter Romanum Pontificem . . . de hujusmodi beneficiis disponere præsumat."

collegiate benefices throughout Christendom. Besides this, by the system of Papal reserves, he never confirmed the direct promotion of any Prelate; but by his skilful promotion of each Bishop to a richer bishopric or archbishopric, and so on to a patriarchate, as on each vacancy the annates or first-fruits were paid, six or more fines would accrue to the treasury. Yet this Pope — though besides his great rapacity, he was harsh, relentless, a cruel persecutor, and betrayed his joy not only at the discomfiture, but at the slaughter of his enemies¹ — had great fame for piety as well as learning, arose every night to pray and to study, and every morning attended Mass.²

¹ "Rallegróssi oltre a modo d' uccisione e morte de' nemici." — Villani, xi. 20.

² Boehmer, who warps everything to the advantage of the Pope, ends with this sentence: "Er war neunzig Jahre alt, und hinterliess einen Schatz von fünf und zwanzig Millionen gold Gulden." Well might he repudiate the absolute poverty of Christ!

CHAPTER VIII.

BENEDICT XII.

JOHN XXII. had contrived to crowd the Conclave with French Prelates. Twenty-four Cardinals met; the general suffrage was in favor of the brother of the Count of Comminges, Bishop of Porto, but the Cardinals insisted on a solemn promise that De Comminges would continue to rule in Avignon. "I had sooner," he said, "yield up the Cardinalate than accept the Pope-don on such conditions." All fell off from the intractable Prelate. In the play of votes, now become usual in the Conclave, all happened at once to throw away their suffrages on one for whom no single vote would have been deliberately given.¹ To his own surprise, and to that of the College of Cardinals and of Christendom, the White Abbot, the Cistercian, James Four- Dec. 20, 1334. nier, found himself Pope. "You have chosen an ass," he said in humility or in irony. He took the name of Benedict XII.

Benedict XII. did himself injustice: he was a man of shrewdness and sagacity; he had been a Benedict XII. great Pope, if his courage had been equal to his pru-

¹ "Et ecce in electione . . . tot cardinalibus quasi insciis, sub altercatione electus extitit." "Ego M. nomino illum, qui si esse non poterit nomino Blancum, quod repertum est a duobus partibus nominatum." — Albert. Argent. p. 125.

dence. His whole Pontificate was a tacit reproach on the turbulence, implacability, and avarice of his predecessor. His first act was to disperse the throng of greedy expectants around the Court at Avignon. He sent them back, each to his proper function. He declared against the practice of heaping benefices — held, according to the phrase, in commendam — on the favored few: he retained that privilege for Cardinals alone. He discouraged the Papal reserves; would not create vacancies by a long ascending line of promotions. The clergy did not forgive him his speech, that he had great difficulty in finding men worthy of advancement. He even opened the coffers of his predecessor: he bestowed 100,000 florins on the Cardinals. He sought for theological peace. He withdrew to the picturesque sources of the Sorga, not yet famed in Petrarch's *July 6, 1335.* *quisite poetry*, to meditate and examine the arguments (he was a man of learning) on the Beatific Vision. He published a full and orthodox determination of the question, that the saints who do not pass through Purgatory immediately behold the Godhead. The heresy of John XXII. was thus at the least implied. He had some thought (he wanted courage to carry out his own better designs) of restoring the See of St. Peter to Italy; but Bologna would not yield up her turbulent independence, and was averse to his reception. Rome was still in a state of strife; and perhaps Robert of Naples did not wish to be overshadowed by the neighborhood of the Pope.¹ Benedict even made the first advance to reconciliation with Louis of Bavaria.

¹ Letter written from the bridge over the Sorga to King Philip, *July 31, 1335.* — Raynald. *sub ann.*

But Benedict XII. was under the hard yoke of the King of France. He soon abandoned all design of emancipation from that control. The magnificent palace which, out of the treasures of Pope John, he began to build, looked like a deliberate determination to fix the Holy See forever on the shores of the Rhone. Avignon was to become the centre and capital of Christendom. The Cardinals began to erect and adorn their splendid and luxurious villas beyond the Rhone. The amicable overtures to Louis of Bavaria were repressed by some irresistible constraint. The Emperor, weak, weary, worn out with strife, would have accepted the most abasing terms. His own excommunication, the interdict on the Empire, weighed him down. He was not without superstitious awe; his days were drawing on; he might die unabsolved.¹ Where the interdict was not observed (in most cities of Germany), there was still some want of solemnity, something of embarrassment in the services of the Church; in a few cities, where the zealous monks or clergy endeavored to maintain it, were heart-burnings, strife, persecution. He would have submitted to swear fealty to the Pope in as ample terms as any former Emperor, and to annul all his acts against Pope John, all acts done as Emperor;² he would revoke all proceedings and judgments of Henry of Luxemburg against Robert of Naples, all the grants and gifts which he had made at Rome; he would agree to accept no oath of fealty, recognition, or any advocacy, or grant any fief in Rome

¹ Schmidt, Geschichte, b. vii. l. 7, p. 324.

² "Quæcunque alia titulo imperii dicta vel facta per nos existunt . . . ita ea omnia irrita et nulla pronunciamus." — Apud Raynaldum, 1336, c. xviii.

or in the territories of the Church. If he broke this treaty, the Pope had power to depose him from all his dignities, or to inflict heavier penalties, without citation or solemnity of law.¹ He would submit to a second coronation in Rome, on a day appointed by the Pope, and quit the city the day after. The Pope was to be the absolute judge of the fulfilment of the treaty.

No sooner had the rumor of these negotiations spread abroad than Benedict XII. was besieged with rude and vehement remonstrances. Ambassadors arrived at Avignon from the Kings of France and of Naples. The Kings of Bohemia and Hungary were known to support their protest. "Would the Pope," they publicly demanded, "maintain a notorious heretic? Let him take heed, lest he himself be implicated in the heresy." Benedict replied, "Would they destroy the Empire?" "Our sovereigns speak not against the Empire, but against a Prince who has done so much wrong to the Church." "Have we not done more wrong? If my predecessors had so willed, Louis would have come with a staff instead of a sceptre, and cast himself at their feet. He has acted under great provocation." "We could not," he subjoined, "have exacted harder terms, if Louis of Bavaria had been a prisoner in one of our dungeon towers.² But Benedict could speak, he could not act, truth and justice: his words are a bitter satire on his own weakness. The King of France took summary measures of compulsion: he seized all the estates of the Cardinals, most

¹ "Liberum sit Romano Pontifici ad alias pœnas procedere contra nos, *precando etiam nos*, si tibi videbitur, imperiali, regiâ et quâlibet aliâ dignitate, absque aliâ vocatione vel juris solemnitate." — Ibid.

² Albert. Argentin. Chron., p. 126.

of them French Prelates, within his realm. The Cardinals besieged the Court; the King of France himself visited Avignon. He made ^{The King of France at Avignon.}

a pompous journey, partly to survey the cities of his kingdom, partly from devotion for the recovery of his son, Prince John. He was accompanied by the Kings of Bohemia and Navarre: he was met by the King of Arragon. He took up his abode in the Ville neuve beyond the Rhone, in his own territory, where the Cardinals had their sumptuous palaces. The Pope, on Good Friday, preached so moving a sermon (disastrous news had arrived from the East) that the King renewed his vows of embarking on the crusade. The other Kings, numberless Dukes, Counts, and Knights, with four Cardinals, were seized with the same contagious impulse. Orders were actually sent to prepare the fleets in all the ports of the south of France; letters were written to the Kings of Hungary, Naples, Cyprus, and to the Venetians to announce the determination.¹ At Avignon the King of France charged Louis of Bavaria with entering into a league with the enemies of France: as though he himself had not occupied cities of the Empire under pretence of protecting them from the pollution of heresy, or as though a league with the enemies of France was an act of hostility to the Pope. And who were these enemies? The war with England had not begun. The obsequious Pope coldly dismissed the Imperial ambassadors.²

But even success against his enemies raised not Louis of Bavaria from his stupor of religious terror. He had wreaked his vengeance on his most dangerous foe,

¹ Froissart, i. 60.

² Letter of the Pope to Louis of Bavaria. — Apud Raynald.

the King of Bohemia; wrested from him Carinthia and the Tyrol by force of arms, and awarded them to the Austrian Princes. "You tell me," said the Pope, "that he is abandoned by all; but who has yet been able to deprive him of his crown?"¹ Still Louis, though repulsed, looked eagerly to Avignon; but so completely did Philip rule the Cardinals, the Cardinals the Pope, that he took the desperate measure of proposing an alliance with the King of France. Philip could not but in courtesy consult the Pope; the Pope could only sanction an alliance with a Prince under excommunication when he had sought and obtained absolution. Perhaps he thought this the best course to gain permission to absolve Louis; perhaps he was alarmed at the confederacy. But Philip would condescend to this alliance only on his own terms. The Emperor was to pledge himself to enter into treaty with no enemy of France (no doubt he had England in view). The negotiations dragged slowly on: the ambassadors of Louis at Avignon grew weary and left April, 1337. the city. Already the Pope had warned the King of France, that if he still persisted in his haughty delay, still exacted intolerable conditions, Louis would throw himself into the arms of England. The Pope was profoundly anxious to avert the damnation which hung over the partisans of Louis in Germany and Italy.²

War was now imminent, inevitable, between France and England. The Pope had interposed his mediation, but in vain.³ Edward III. treated with outward re-

¹ Albert. Argentin. p. 126, apud Urstisium.

² Letter from the Pope to Philip. — Raynald. 1337, c. ii.

³ There are several letters MS., B. M. on this subject.

spect, but with no more, the Pope's solemn warning not to be guilty of an alliance with Louis of Bavaria, the contumacious rebel, and the excommunicated outcast of the Church.¹ The English clergy were with the King. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London and Winchester, disregarded the Pope's letters, and opposed his Legates. The Emperor rose in importance. The Pope reproached him afterwards with breaking off the negotiations at Avignon, withdrawing his ambassadors, and not appearing at the appointed day, Michaelmas.² Yet all his conduct showed, that if he had hoped for absolution, Louis of Bavaria would have bought it at any price of degradation. He might seem ready to drink the last dregs of humiliation. He had made, before this, another long appeal to the Pope; he had excused himself, by all kinds of pitiful equivocations, for all his damnable acts in the usurpation of the Empire, and the creation of the Antipope; he forswore all his bold partisans, Marsilio of Padua, John of Jaudun; declared himself ignorant of the real meaning of their writings; threw off Michael of Cesena and the Spiritual Franciscans; asserted himself to hold the orthodox doctrine on the poverty of Christ. This had been his sixth Oct. 28, 1338. embassy to the Court of Avignon.³ Now, however,

¹ MS., B. M. A letter, dated July 20, 1337, denounces the crimes of Louis of Bavaria, his offences against John XXII., his consorting with notorious heretics in Italy, his elevation of Peter of Corvara to the Antipope-dom. Benedict, who had treated him with mildness in hope of his penitence, entered into negotiations with him. King Edward is urged to withdraw from all recognition of Louis as Emperor, till he should have made full satisfaction to the Church. See, following letters, his dread of Edward's alliance "cum Theutonicis," Nov. 13, 1338. The Pope declares the Empire vacant, the full right of so ordaining in the Pope.

² Lit. ad Archiepisc. Colon., apud Raynald. 1338, c. 3.

³ Oehlschlager, Urkunden, lxvi.

Louis took a higher tone: he threatened to march to Avignon, and to extort absolution by force of arms. For not only was his alliance eagerly solicited by England: Germany was roused to indignation. Diet after

Movement in
Germany.

Diet met, ever more and more resolved to maintain their independent right to elect the Sovereign of the Empire. Henry of Virneburg had been forced by the Pope on the reluctant Chapter and reluctant Emperor as Archbishop of Mentz; but Henry was now in direct opposition to the Pope, under excommunication. He summoned an assembly of the March, 1338. Prelates and clergy at Spires. With the utmost unanimity they agreed to send letters, by the Bishop of Coire and Count Gerlach of Nassau, to demand the reconciliation of Louis of Bavaria (they did not call him Emperor) with the Church, and so the deliverance of the German churches and clergy from their wretched state of strife and confusion. The Pope openly refused an answer to these ambassadors; but yet it was believed in Germany that he had whispered into their ears, not without tears, that he would willingly grant the absolution; but that if he did, the King of France had threatened to treat him with worse indignity than Philip the Fair had treated Boniface July 1, 1338. VIII.¹ To the excommunicated Archbishop of Mentz he deigned no reply; but to the Archbishop of Cologne he spoke in milder language, but threw the whole blame of the rupture on the Bavarian. Four

Diets.
April 19,
May 18,
July 16,
Aug. 8.

other Diets were held of Prelates, Princes, Nobles, at Cologne, Frankfort, Rhense near Coblentz, again at Frankfort.

At Frankfort the Emperor appeared, and almost in

¹ Albertus Argentin.

tears complained of the obduracy of the Pope, and charged the King of France with preventing the reconciliation in order to debase and degrade the Imperial crown. He repeated the Lord's Prayer, the Ave-Maria, and the Apostles' creed to prove his orthodoxy. The assembly declared that he had done enough as satisfaction to the Pope: they pronounced all the Papal proceedings, even the excommunication, null and void. If the clergy would not celebrate the divine services, they must be compelled to do so. The meeting at Rhense was more imposing. Six of the Elec- July 18.

tors, all but the King of Bohemia, were present.¹ It is called the first meeting of the Electoral College. They solemnly agreed that the holy Roman Empire and they the Prince-Electors had been assailed, limited, and aggrieved in their honors, rights, customs, and liberties; that they would maintain, guard, assert those rights against all and every one without exception; that no one would obtain dispensation, absolution, relaxation, abolition of his vow; that he should be, and was declared to be, faithless and traitorous before God and man who should not maintain all this against any opponent whatsoever. The States-General at Frankfort passed, as a fundamental law of the Empire, a declaration that the Imperial dignity and power are from God alone; that an Emperor elected by the concordant suffrage or a majority of the electoral suffrages has plenary Imperial power, and does not need the approbation, confirmation, or authority of the Pope, or the Apostolic See, or any other.²

¹ *Chronicon Vintoduran.* apud Eccard, i. p. 1844. *Chronicon Petren.* apud Menckenium, iii. 337. Raynald. 1338, c. viii.

² "Nec Papæ sive Sedis Apostolicæ aut alicujus alterius approbatione,

This declaration was the signal for an active controversy : for daring acts of defiance on the Papal side, of persecution by the Imperial party. The Pope's ban of excommunication was nailed upon the gate of the Cathedral at Frankfort. At Frankfort all the Canons and Dominicans, in many cities on the Rhine the Dominicans and all known partisans of the Pope, all those who refused to celebrate the service, were expelled from their convents.

At a Diet at Coblenz the Emperor and the King of England met. Two thrones were raised in the market-place, on which the monarchs took their seats. The Emperor held the sceptre in his right hand, the globe in his left: a knight stood with a drawn sword over his head. Above 17,000 men-at-arms surrounded the assembly. The King of England recognized the Emperor excommunicated by the Pope. Before the Chief Sovereign of Christendom, Edward arraigned Philip of France as unjustly withholding from him not only Normandy, Anjou, and Aquitaine, but the throne of France, his maternal inheritance. The Emperor then rose. He accused Philip of refusing homage for the fiefs held of the Empire. He declared Philip to have forfeited those fiefs, to be out of the protection of the Empire, till he should have restored the kingdom of France to its rightful owner, the King of England. He declared the King of England Imperial Vicar over all the provinces west of the Rhine, and from Cologne to the sea. All the Princes of the Low Countries became thus his allies or vassals. The Emperor and the King of England sent their com-

Meeting with
King Edward
of England.
Sept. 3.

confirmatione, auctoritate indiget vel consensu." — Oehlenschläger, No. lxviii. Rebdorf, Annal. apud Freher, i. 616.

mon defiance to the King of France. Pope Benedict, it was said, rejoiced at that defiance.¹

Yet all this ostentation of defiance and scorn, this display of German independence, the determination of the electors to maintain their own rights, this confederacy of prelates and nobles and the States-General to repel the pretensions of the Pope, as to any control over the election of the Emperor, the popular excitement against the papalizing clergy and monks, the elaborate arguments of the advocates of the imperial power, the alliance with England — could not repress the versatility of Louis of Bavaria, nor allay his terror of the Papal censures. On the first excuse he began to withdraw his feeble support from the King of England, to revoke his title of Imperial Vicar.² He listened to the first advances of Philip who lured him with hope of reconciliation to the Roman See. Two years had not passed when Pope Benedict beheld at his court at Avignon three imperial ambassadors (not the first since the treaty with England), the Duke of Saxony, the Count of Holland, the Count Hohenberg, renowned for his legal knowledge. They were accompanied or met by

¹ "De quâ diffidatione," says Albert. Argentin. (he was a dependent on the Bishop of Strasburg), "Papa Benedictus, eâ intellectâ, multum jocundabatur." — P. 128.

² MS., B. M. The Pope, who had made new proposals of peace between France and England, urges Edward to give up the Vicariate accepted from the excommunicated Louis of Bavaria, Oct. 12, 1339. Benedict's exertions for peace between France and England were constant, earnest, solemn. There is a letter on Edward's assumption of any pretensions to the throne of France: the crown does not descend in the female line; if it did, there are nearer heirs than Edward: let him not trust to Germans and Flemings. March 3, 1340. See Edward's elaborate answer. Edward is admonished not to be too proud of his victories, Oct. 27, 1340. The King of France had agreed to accept the Pope's mediation as "persona privata."

an ambassador from the King of France, supplicating the Pope to grant absolution to the orthodox, pious, and upright Louis of Bavaria. His letters were somewhat colder and less urgent. They pressed the abrogation of censures, which endangered such countless souls, as far as might be consistent with the honor of the Church. Even a Pope in Avignon could not submit to this insolent dictation, and from a King of France, embarrassed, as Philip now was, by such formidable enemies. Benedict replied with dignity, mingled with his characteristic shrewdness and sarcasm, "that he could not, according to the good pleasure of the King of France, hold Louis of Bavaria one day for a heretic, the next for an orthodox believer : Louis must make his submission, and undergo canonical penance." The world saw through both ; it was thought that the King of France pretended to wish that which he did not wish ; the Pope not to wish that which in fact was his real wish.¹

Benedict XII. did not live to fulfil his peaceful designs. He died, leaving his reputation to be disputed with singular pertinacity by friends and foes. He was a man wiser in speech than in action, betraying by his keen words that he saw what was just and right, but dared not follow it.² Yet political courage alone was wanting. He was resolutely superior to the papal vice of nepotism. On one only of his family, and that a deserving man, he bestowed a rich benefice. To the

¹ Albert. Argentin. p. 128. Vintoduran. p. 1863. Benedict Vit. viii. apud Baluzium.

² See the very curious account of a personal interview which Albert of Strasburg had with the Pope, which shows at once his leaning towards the Emperor and his jesting disposition. — P. 129.

rest he said : " As James Fournier I knew you well, as Pope I know you not. I will not put myself in the power of the King of France by encumbering myself with a host of needy relatives." He had the moral fortitude to incur unpopularity with the clergy by persisting in his slow, cautious, and regular distribution of benefices ; with the monks by rigid reforms. He hated the monks, and even the Mendicant Orders. He showed his hatred, as they said, by the few promotions which he bestowed upon them ; and hatred so shown was sure to meet with hatred in return. His weaknesses or vices were not likely to find much charity. He was said to be fond of wine, to like gay and free conversation. A bitter epitaph describes him as a Nero, as death to the laity, a viper to the clergy, without truth, a mere cup of wine.¹ Yet of this Nero there is not one recorded act of cruelty (compare him with John XXII.) ; he was guiltless of human blood shed in war. He may have shown a viper's tooth to the clergy ; he was too apt to utter biting and unwelcome truths. The justice of the other charges may be fairly estimated by the injustice of these. The last was most easy of exaggeration ; another tradition ascribes to the habits of Benedict the coarse proverb, " as drunk as a Pope." Another more disgraceful accusation has been preserved or invented on account of the fame of one whose honor was involved in it. He is said to have seduced and kept as a concubine a sister of Petrarch. But this rests on the unsupported authority of a late biographer of the Poet.²

¹ " Ille fuit Nero, laicis mors, vipera clero,
Devis a vero, cuppa repleta nero."

² It is absolutely without contemporary authority or allusion, even in the

later biographies in Baluzius, which, perhaps written by some of the unpreferred clergy or monks, carefully record all the other charges. It first appeared in Squarzafico's "Life of Petrarch." If De Sade is right in supposing Petrarch's letter to refer to Benedict XII., he speaks of him as "madidus mero," but there is not a word about licentious manners.—De Sade.

CHAPTER IX.

CLEMENT VI.

THE French Cardinals were all-powerful in the Conclave. The successor of Benedict XII. was Clement VI. May 7, 1342. Cardinal Peter Roger, of a noble house of Marmont in the Limousin. He had been prior of St. Bandille at Nismes, Abbot of Fécamp, Bishop of Arras, Archbishop of Sens, Archbishop of Rouen. A Frenchman by birth, inclination, character, at his inauguration all was French. For the Emperor, for the Senator of Rome, for the Orsinis, Colonnas, Annibaldi, his stirrup was held by the Duke of Normandy, son and heir of the King of France, with the Dukes of Bourbon and Burgundy, and the Dauphin of Vienne. He took the name of Clement VI.; it might almost seem an announcement of the policy which was to distinguish his popedom. If Benedict XII. stood in every respect in strong contrast to John XXII., the rule of Clement's administration might seem to be the studious reversal of that of his predecessor. All the benefices, which the tardy and hesitating conscientious- His first acts. ness of Benedict had left vacant, were filled at once by the lavish and hasty grants of Clement. He declared a great number of bishoprics and abbacies vacant as Papal reserves, or as filled by void elections; he granted them away with like prodigality. It was ob-

jected that no former Pope had assumed this power. "They knew not," he answered, "how to act as Pope."¹ He issued a Brief that all poor clergy who would present themselves at Avignon within two months should partake of his bounty. An eye-witness declared that 100,000 greedy applicants crowded the streets of Avignon.² If Clement acted up to his maxim, that no one ought to depart unsatisfied from the palace of a prince, how vast and inexhaustible must have been the wealth and preferment at the disposal of the Pope! The reforms of the monastic orders were mitigated or allowed to fall into disuse. The clemency of the Pope had something of that dramatic show which characterizes and delights his countrymen. A man of low rank had in former days done him some injury. The man, in hopes that he and his offence had been forgotten, presented a petition to the Pope. Clement remembered both too well. Twice he threw down the petition and trampled it under foot. He was then heard by his attendants to murmur, "Devil, tempt me not to revenge!" He took up and set his seal to the petition.³

If Clement was indulgent to others, he was not less so to himself. The Court at Avignon became the most splendid, perhaps the gayest, in Christendom. The Provençals might almost think their brilliant and chivalrous Counts restored to power and enjoyment. The papal palace spread out in extent and magnificence. The young art of painting was fostered by the encouragement of Italian artists.⁴ The Pope was

¹ Vit. iii. et v. Clement VI. apud Baluzium. p. 284, p. 321.

² Vit. i. p. 264.

³ Ibid.

⁴ See Kugler. Giotto had painted for Clement V., i. 123.

more than royal in the number and attire of his retainers. The papal stud of horses commanded general admiration. The life of Clement was a constant succession of ecclesiastical pomps and gorgeous receptions and luxurious banquets. Ladies were admitted freely to the Court,¹ the Pope mingled with ease in the gallant intercourse. If John XXII., and even the more rigid Benedict, did not escape the imputation of unclerical license, Clement VI., who affected no disguise in his social hours, would hardly be supposed superior to the common freedom of the ecclesiastics of his day. The Countess of Turenne, if not, as general report averred, actually so, had at least many of the advantages of the Pope's mistress — the distribution of preferments and benefices to any extent, which this woman, as rapacious as she was handsome and imperious, sold with shameless publicity.²

A voluptuous Court was not likely to raise the moral condition of the surrounding city. Petrarch had lived for some time at Avignon, under the patronage of the Cardinal Colonna, and James Colonna, Bishop of Lombes. His passion for Laura had begun in a church; and though her severe and rare virtue gave that exquisite unattainted purity to his love verses; though as a poet his tenderness never melts into earthly passion; his highest raptures are Platonism; yet Petrarch was not altogether, though he became Canon of Lombes and Archdeacon of Parma, preserved from the contagion of his age; he had two natural children. But of the moral corruption of

Morals of
Avignon.

¹ "Mulierum et bonorum et potentie cupidus . . . ipse Francis Francus ferventer adhæsit." — Albert. Argentin. p. 132.

² Matteo Villani.

Avignon he repeatedly speaks with loathing abhorrence; Rome itself in comparison was the seat of matronly virtue: by his account it was one vast brothel. He fled to the quiet and unvitiated seclusion of Vacluse.¹

Clement VI., with his easy temper, was least likely to restrain that proverbial vice of the Popes, which has formed for itself a proper name — Nepotism. On his brothers, nephews, kindred, relatives, compatriots, were accumulated grants, benefices, promotions. One nephew, at the age of eighteen, was Notary of the Apostolic Court and Cardinal.²

Scarcely had Clement ascended the throne, when the Roman people sent a deputation to his Holiness to urge him to return to his See. Petrarch, who had been crowned at Rome, had acquired the rights of a Roman citizen, and was one of the eighteen ambassadors. Among the rest lurked undistinguished Nicolo Rienzi, the future Tribune. Petrarch,

Embassy
from Rome.

¹ This repulsive subject cannot be fully understood without the study of Petrarch's letters, especially the book "*Sine Titulo*." Avignon was the sink of Christendom. "*Nec tam propter se quam propter concurrentes et coactas ibi concretasque orbis sordes ac nequitias hic locus a principio multis atque ante alios mihi pessimus omnium visus est.*" — Sen. l. 10, ep. 2. But this wickedness was not only among the low, the retainers of the Church, or the gown. "*Tam calidi, tamque præcipientes in Venerem senes sunt, tanta eos ætatis et status et virium cepit oblivio, sic in libidines inardescunt, sic in omne ruunt dedecus, quasi omnes eorum gloria, non in cruce Christi sit, sed in comessationibus, et ebrietatibus, et quæ hæc sequuntur in cubilibus, impudentiis . . . Spectat hæc Sathan ridens atque in pari tripudio delectatus, atque inter decrepitos ac puellas arbiter sedens, stupet plus illos agere, quam se hortari.*" I must break off. "*Mitto stupra, raptus, incestus, adulteria, qui jam Pontificalis ludi lasciviæ sunt.*" — P. 730, Ed. Bas. Again I must pause; I dare not quote even the Latin. It is not enough to say that Petrarch was an Italian, and eager to restore the Papacy to Rome, or to treat such passages as satiric declamation.

² Vit. i. p. 265. Matteo Villani apud Muratori, xiv. l. iii. c. 43.

as the crowned Poet of Rome, addressed the Pope in a long piece of Latin verse. Rome, the aged female, besought the return of the Pope; she tempted him with the enumeration of her countless religious treasures, her wonder-working relics, her churches, her apostolic shrines.

The Pope, as usual, put off this supplication with fine words, but he granted one request. The ^{The Jubilee.} Jubilee appointed by Pope Boniface for every hundred years was but a partial blessing to mankind; very few indeed lived to that period. Clement ordained that it should be celebrated at the end of fifty years.

One man alone was excepted from the all-embracing clemency of the Pope—Louis of Bavaria. ^{Louis of Bavaria.} Already, as Archbishop of Rouen, Clement had preached before the Kings of France and Bohemia a furious and abusive declamation, in which he played on the name of the Bavarian. Louis had not merely joined in the persecution of those ecclesiastics or monks who obeyed the papal interdict; he had done an act of usurpation on the ecclesiastical authority, which, besides its contempt of the Pope, had inflamed against him the implacable resentment of the King of Bohemia. Of his imperial authority he had dissolved the marriage of Margaret of Carinthia, heiress of great part of the Tyrol, and sanctioned her repudiation of her husband, a younger son of the King of Bohemia.¹ He had then given a dispensation for her marriage with his own son, within the prohibited degrees.² The

¹ Albert of Strasburg gives a strange account of this ill-assorted wedlock. "Cumque Joannes Comes Tyrolis, filius Bohemi *impotens*, uxorem suam *semifatuam* plurimum molestaret, inter alia, ejus mordendo mamillas."

² Albert (p. 119) calls the act of Louis "inconsuetum et horribile. O

bold and faithful assertors of the imperial power, Marsilio of Padua and William of Ockham had been again his counsellors; they declared the power of dissolving marriages, and of dispensations, to be inherent in the imperial crown.

Yet on the accession of Clement, Louis sent a submissive embassy to the Pope, to demand absolution. At the same time he reminded Philip of France of his solemn oath to interpose his friendly mediation. The Pope sternly answered that Louis must first acknowledge his sins and heresies, entreat pardon, lay down his imperial power at the Pope's feet, and restore the Tyrol to its rightful lord.

During the same year Clement published a new Bull of excommunication throughout Christendom, which, if Louis did not abdicate all his imperial authority within three months, and appear to receive judgment before the papal tribunal, threatened him with still heavier and worldly penalties. The Arch-
April 12, 1348. bishops, Henry of Mentz and Baldwin of Treves, were ordered immediately to take steps for the election of a King of the Romans.

Louis was constantly vacillating between the most
Vacillation of Louis. haughty defiance of the Pope and the meanest submission. At one time he alarmed the religious fears of his boldest partisans by his lofty pretensions; at another, disquieted them by his abject humiliation. He now threatened not to recognize Clement as Pope; he gave away bishoprics and benefices to which the Pope had already presented; he

idolorum servitus avaritia, quæ tantos principes confudisti, ex quibus iterum inter Bohemos et Principem et filios suos non immerito livor edax et odia suscitantur."

seized the money which the Pope's collectors were exacting for a crusade. But no sooner had the Pope's orders to the Archbishops to summon the electors to discuss a new election, and the publication of the papal excommunication throughout Germany, produced some effect ; no sooner had the electors met at Rhense, than Louis hastened to entreat their forbearance, to promise his utmost endeavors to obtain reconciliation with the Pope, and to be guided altogether by their counsel.

Not content with this, Louis plunged desperately and at once into the lowest depths of humiliation. The Pope at the close of the three months had held a consistory. It was proclaimed in Latin and in German, "Does any one appear for Louis of Bavaria?" None replied. He was pronounced in contumacy. At the same time came the answer of the King of France. "He had not sought the favor of the Pope in a becoming manner."¹

And now even the Pope himself was astonished by a proposal from Louis, that he, Clement, should absolutely dictate the form of submission : the Degrading terms accepted by Louis. ambassadors of Louis would receive full powers to subscribe to whatever conditions the Pope might be pleased to impose. Now was executed a procuration the most disgraceful, the most rigorous, that Louis ought not to have signed had he been in the Pope's prison.² It might seem to tax the ingenuity of the Pope's pride and enmity to frame more degrading conditions. Louis was to acknowledge and repudiate all his transgressions committed against John XXII. or his legates in the

¹ Albert. Argentin.

² So writes the author of the *Paralipomena*. — *Chronic. Urspergens.* p. 271.

election of an Antipope, the protection of Marsilio of Padua and his fellows, his appeal to the Council; he was to condemn and declare accursed all the errors of Marsilio and his partisans. As penance for these offences, Louis was to undertake a crusade, build churches and monasteries, and do all other acts to the satisfaction of the Pope; he was to entreat pardon and absolution for all his crimes, to lay aside unconditionally the imperial title assumed at Rome; to confess that he had borne it heretically and unlawfully; to surrender his whole power into the hands of the Pope: as regarded the Kings of France and Bohemia, to conform himself entirely to the Pope's will; humbly to beseech the Pope to restore him to that state in which he was before his condemnation by Pope John; formally to take the amplest oath of allegiance ever taken by his predecessors to the Pope, to confirm all grants, to swear never to assail the papal territory, and be in all things, even the most severely trying, absolutely and entirely obedient to the Pope; to surrender his whole power, state, will, judgment, to the free and unlimited disposition of the Pope.¹ The imperial ambassadors, the Dauphin of Vienne, the Bishops of Augsburg and Bamberg, and Ulric of Augsburg, had full authority Jan. 1244. to sign these terms, which Henry IV. might almost have been ashamed of at Canosa. They swore on the Gospels and by the soul of the Emperor, that he would truly observe them. They signed them in full consistory, in the presence of twenty-three Cardinals and numbers of French, Italian, and German prelates.

¹ "Res, statum, velle et nolle, nihil sibi proprio arbitrio retinendo, absolute et liberaliter in manibus dicti Domini nostri Papæ." — Lud. IV. Submissio, in Baluz. Miscellan. ii. 272, 276.

But even yet the insatiate pretensions of the Roman See had not reached their height. The Emperor had drunk the very lees of humiliation ; the Empire itself must be prostrate, as of old, at the feet of the Pope : one more precedent must be furnished for the total subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power. New articles were prepared ; the Emperor was to swear that all acts hitherto done by himself or in his name were invalid ; he was to entreat the Pope, when he removed the ban of excommunication, to give validity to such acts ; he was to make oath, not only not to attack the territory of the Church, but especially the three dependent kingdoms, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica ; that he would enter into no alliance with heretics, whether men, princes, or kings ; that he would issue no ordinance as Emperor or King of the Romans without special permission of the Roman See ; that he would supplicate the Pope, after absolution, to grant him the administration of the empire ; that he would make the states of the empire swear by word and by writing to stand by the Church. If he should not fulfil all these terms, should any doubt arise concerning these articles, the Pope alone was to judge thereof.

Louis, without appeasing his enemies, had sunk into the most abject contempt with his rightful partisans : this contempt would not condescend to disguise or dissemble itself. At a Diet at Frankfort the Sept. 1844.

Emperor ventured to appear, and to submit Indignation of Germany. to the States of Germany his own shame and the shame of the Empire. Some lingering personal respect for Louis and for his high office constrained the assembly ; but though he had forfeited his own dignity,

they would maintain theirs. Wicker, the Prothonotary of Trèves, in a long and skilful speech, showed the usurpation of the Pope on the rights of the Empire. An embassy was determined to represent to Pope Clement that the conditions to which Louis had submitted could not be fulfilled without violating his oath to the States. In other quarters there were loud murmurs that an Emperor who had so debased the holy office, ought to be compelled to abdicate: the throne had been so degraded by the Bavarian, that no Bavarian should ever hereafter be raised to the throne.

The Pope, after some time, took a strong aggressive measure. Henry of Virneburg, Archbishop of Mentz, was deposed by his sole authority.¹ Gerlach, a brother of the powerful Count of Holland, whose estates were in the neighborhood, was elevated, though but twenty years old, to the Metropolitan See.

The Pope scrupled not to break, if he could, the bruised reed. A new Bull of excommunication, on the pretence that Louis had betrayed reluctance or tardiness in the fulfilment of the treaty, was promulgated, which in the vigor and fury of its curses transcended all that had yet, in the wildest times, issued from the Roman See. "We humbly implore the Divine power to confute the madness and crush the pride of the aforesaid Louis, to cast him down by the might of the Lord's right hand, to deliver him into the hands of his enemies, and those that persecute him. Let the unforeseen snare fall upon him! Be he accursed in his going out and his coming in! The Lord strike him with madness, and blindness, and fury! May the heavens rain lightning upon him! May the

April 11,
1346.

April 18,
1346.

¹ Albert. Argentin. p. 135.

wrath of Almighty God, and of the blessed apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, turn against him in this world and in the world to come! May the whole world war upon him! May the earth open and swallow him up quick! May his name be blotted out in his own generation, his memory perish from the earth! May the elements be against him, his dwelling be desolate! The merits of all the Saints at rest confound him and execute vengeance on him in this life! Be his sons cast forth from their homes and be delivered before his eyes into the hands of his enemies!"¹ The Electors were called upon to proceed at once to the creation of a new Emperor.

Of these electors two only, his son the Margrave of Brandenburg, and the deposed Archbishop of Mentz, adhered to Louis. The three ecclesiastical electors, including Gerlach of Mentz, the King of Bohemia, the Duke of Saxony, were arrayed against him. The Elector Palatine vacillated between the parties. John, the King of Bohemia, the rival of Louis, now imbittered by the affair of the Tyrol, was blind, and so disqualified for the Imperial crown. His son, ^{Charles of Moravia} Charles of Moravia (of the age of thirty-six), was the representative of the house of Luxemburg. The Pope, not without fierce debates in the consistory, had determined to put forward Charles. The French cardinals, headed by the Cardinal Perigord, the Gascons by the Cardinal de Comminges, came to high words in the presence of the Pope. Each charged the other with treason to the Church. De Comminges accused Talleyrand de Perigord as implicated in the murder of Andrew, King of Naples.

¹ Raynaldus, sub ann.

The Pope had refused to hear the ambassadors of the King of Hungary, when they demanded vengeance for that murder. The dispute almost came to a personal conflict. Talleyrand rose up to strike De Comminges; the Pope and the other cardinals parted them with difficulty. They retired in sullen wrath; each fortified his palace and armed his retainers. It was long before they were brought even to the outward show of amity.¹

Charles obtained not the support of the Pope without hard and humiliating conditions. He swore to those conditions before the Conclave. Eight days after his election he was to ratify his oath. He was to rescind all the acts of Louis of Bavaria; he was so religiously to respect the territories of the Church to their widest extent, that he was only to enter Rome for his coronation, and on the day of his coronation to depart again from the city.

The electors met at Rhense; the Empire was declared long vacant; Charles of Moravia was proclaimed King of the Romans. But Frankfort had shut her gates against the Electors. Aix-la-Chapelle shut her gates against the new Emperor. Louis, low July 11, 1246. as he had fallen, almost below contempt, had still partisans; Germany at least had partisans. An assembly at Spire declared the election at Rhense void; and denied the right of the Pope to depose an Emperor.

War, a terrible civil war, seemed inevitable. But gratitude, kindred, the unextinguished passion for chivalrous adventure, led the blind John of Bohemia, accompanied by his son, the elected Emperor, to join

¹ Raynaldus, sub ann.

the army of the King of France, now advancing to repel the invasion of Edward III. of England. The blind King fell nobly on the field of Crecy. ^{Battle of Crecy.} His Imperial son was the first to fly; he was of ^{Aug. 26, 1346.} the few that escaped the carnage of that disastrous day. Charles was thus King of Bohemia. As King of the Romans, though Aix-la-Chapelle and Cologne still closed their gates, he was crowned at Bonn. But Germany scoffed at the Priests' Emperor; the ally of the discomfited King of France, the fugitive of Crecy, made but slow progress either by arms or by policy. The unexpected death of Louis of Bavaria ^{Death of Louis of Bavaria. October.} left him without rival. Louis died the last Emperor excommunicated by the Pope; the Emperor, of all those that had been involved in strife with the Papacy, who had demeaned himself to the lowest baseness of submission.

Yet Germany would not acknowledge an Emperor nominated by the Pope. The Empire was ^{Gunther of Schwarzenburg. 1348.} offered to Edward of England; it was declined by him. The election then fell on Gunther of Schwarzenburg.¹ His resignation and his death relieved Charles from a dangerous rival; but Charles was obliged to submit to a new election at Frankfort. His coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle at length established his right to the throne. Still he was recog- ^{June, 1349.} nized not as appointed by the Pope; but raised by the free choice of Germany to the kingdom of the Romans.²

¹ Schmidt, Geschichte, p. 359.

² Hervart von Hohenberg published two learned works, in defence of Louis of Bavaria against Bzovius, the continuator of Baronius. They contain many of the documents.

In Italy, tragical and wonderful events marked the Pontificate of Clement VI. In Naples, King June 19, 1348. Robert had closed his long and busy reign. The crown had descended to his granddaughter, the heiress of the Duke of Calabria. Joanna was wedded in her early youth to her kinsman Andrew, of the royal house of Hungary. Joanna now stood arraigned before the world as an adulteress; if not as an accomplice, as having connived at the murder of her husband.¹ Louis, King of Hungary, Jan. 15, 1347 invaded the kingdom with a strong force to avenge his brother's death, and to assert his right to the throne as heir of Charles Martel. Joanna fled to Avignon; she was for a time placed under custody; but the Pope granted a dispensation for her marriage with her kinsman, Louis of Tarento. She returned to Naples, having sold to the Pope the city of Avignon, part of her kingdom of Provence.² The Pope thus recognized her title; he became henceforth the lord and owner of Avignon. War continued to rage in Naples between the Hungarian faction, and that of Joanna and Louis of Tarento. At length the determination of the contest (the cause having, as will appear, been heard on his tribunal by Nicolo Rienzi at Rome), was referred to the Pope, the lord paramount of the kingdom of Naples. After a year's examination by three Cardinals, Joanna pleaded that she was under a magic spell, which compelled her to hate her husband. Against such a plea who would venture to

¹ Compare Giannone, l. xxiii. He is favorable to the character and abilities of Joanna.

² Vit. Clement VI. apud Baluzium. The price was 30,000 florins of gold of Florence. Lunig, quoted in Giannone, xxiii. 1.

deny her innocence ? and in this justification the Pope, and on the Pope's authority the world, acquiesced. The award of Clement absolved Joanna from the crime:¹ with her husband, Louis Prince of Tarento, she was restored to the throne. Peace was ^{Peace in} established between Naples and Hungary. ^{1851.} Rome, meantime, had beheld the rise and fall of Rienzi.

¹ The King of Hungary openly accused the Cardinal Talleyrand Perigord as an accomplice in the murder.

CHAPTER X.

RIENZI.

ROME for nearly forty years had been deserted by the Popes: she had ceased to be the religious capital of the world. She retained the shrines and the relics of the great apostles and the famous old churches, the Lateran, St. Peter, and St. Paul; some few pilgrims came from all parts of Europe to the city still hallowed by these sacred monuments, to the Jerusalem of the West. But the tide of homage and tribute which had flowed for centuries towards the shrine of the successors of St. Peter had now taken another course. All the ecclesiastical causes, and the riches they poured into the papal treasury; the constant influx of business which created large expenditure; the thousands of strangers, which year after year used to be seen in Rome from motives secular or religious, now thronged the expanding streets of Avignon. Rome, thus degraded from her high ecclesiastical position, was thrown back more forcibly than ever on her older reminiscences. She had lost her new, she would welcome with redoubled energy whatever might recall her ancient supremacy. At the height of the Papal power old Rome had been perpetually breaking out into rebellion against younger Rome. Her famous titles had always seemed to work like magic on her ear. It was now

Republican and now Imperial Rome which threw off disdainfully the thralldom of the Papal dominion. The Consul Crescentius, the Senator Brancaleone, Arnold of Brescia, the Othos, the Fredericks, Henry of Luxemburg, Louis of Bavaria, had proclaimed a new world-ruling Roman republic, or a new world-ruling Roman Empire. Dante's universal monarchy, Petrarch's aspirations for the independence of Italy, fixed the seat of their power, splendor, liberty, at Rome.

The history of Rienzi may now be related almost in Rienzi's own words, and that history, thus *Rienzi*, revealed, shows his intimate connection not only with Roman and Papal affairs, but is strangely moulded up with the Christianity of his time.¹ His autobiography ascends even beyond his cradle. The Tribune disdains the vulgar parentage of the Transteverine innkeeper and the washerwoman, whom Rome believed to be the authors of his birth. With a kind of proud shamelessness he claims descent, spurious indeed, from the Imperial house of Luxemburg. His account is strangely minute. "When Henry of Luxemburg went up to be crowned (May, 1312) at Rome, the church of St. Peter, in which the coronation ought to have been

¹ These documents, unknown to Gibbon and to later writers, were published by Dr. Papencordt, "*Cola di Rienzi und seine Zeit*," Hamburg and Gotha, 1841. (Compare *Quarterly Review*, vol. lxi. p. 346, by the author.) They are chiefly letters addressed by Rienzi to Charles, Emperor and King of Bohemia, and to the Archbishop of Prague, written during his residence in Bohemia after his first fall. They throw a strong, if not a clear and steady light upon his character. These documents were first discovered and made use of by Pelzel, the historian of Bohemia. The original MS. is not to be found, but the copy made by Pelzel for his own use is in the library of Count Thun at Tetschen. It was published almost entire by Dr. Papencordt.

celebrated, was in the power of his enemies, the Roman Guelfs and the King of Naples. Strong barricades and defences, as well as the deep Tiber, separated the two parts of the city. Henry was therefore compelled to hold his coronation in the church of St. John Lateran. But the religious Emperor was very anxious, before he left Rome, to pay his devotions at the shrine of St. Peter, and to see the church which had witnessed the coronation of so many Emperors. He put on the garb of a pilgrim, and in this disguise, with a single attendant, found his way into the church of St. Peter. A report spread abroad that the Emperor had passed the barriers in secret; the gates and bridges were instantly closed and jealously watched; and a herald was sent to put the Guelfic faction on their guard, and to offer a large reward for his capture. As soon as the Emperor and his attendant perceived this movement, they stole hastily along a street by the bank of the river, and, finding all the passages closed, they took refuge, under pretence of going in to drink, in the hostel or small inn kept by Rienzi's supposed father. There they took possession of a small chamber, and lay hid for ten or fifteen days. The Emperor's attendant went out to procure provisions: in the mean time, Rienzi's mother, who was young and handsome, ministered to the Emperor (Rienzi's own words!), 'as their handmaids did to holy David and to the righteous Abraham.' Henry afterwards escaped to the Aventine, retired from Rome, and died in the August of that year. "But as there is nothing hidden that does not come to light, when his mother found out the high rank of her lover, she could not help, like a very woman, telling the secret of her pregnancy by him to

Story of his birth.

her particular friend ; this particular friend, like a woman told it to another particular friend, and so on, till the rumor got abroad. His mother, too, on her death-bed, confessed the whole, as it was her duty, to the priest. Rienzi, after his mother's death, was sent by his father to Anagni, where he remained till his twentieth year. On his return, this marvellous story was related to him by some of his mother's friends, and by the priest who attended her death-bed.¹ Out of respect for his mother's memory, Rienzi was always impatient of the scandal, and denied it in public, but he believed it in his heart,² and the imperial blood stirring in his veins, he began to disdain his plebeian life, to dream of honors and glories far above his lowly condition. He sought every kind of instruction ; he began to read and study history, and the lives of great and good men, till he became impatient to realize in his actions the lofty lessons which he read." Was this an audacious fiction, and when first promulgated ? Was it after his fall, to attach himself to the imperial house when he offered himself, as will hereafter appear, as an instrument to reinstate the Cæsarean power in Italy ?³

¹ The priest must have heard it *sub sigillo confessionis* ; but Roman priests in those days may not have been over strict.

² There are strong obvious objections to this story. The German writers know nothing of Henry's ten or fifteen days' absence from his camp, which could hardly have been concealed, as it must have caused great alarm. Consider too Rienzi's long suspicious silence, though he labors to account for it. He endeavored, he avers, to suppress the report at the time of his greatness, because any kind of German connection would have been highly unpopular in Rome ; but that the rumor prevailed among many persons of both sexes and all ages. Rienzi, on the other hand, appeals to a Roman noble, who at the court of Louis of Bavaria had spoken freely of his great secret, "*Tam sibi quam suis ut audiui domesticis hanc conditionem meam sibi consciam revelavit.*"

³ De Sade had picked up what may seem a loose reminiscence of the

Be this as it may, the adolescence of Rienzi was passed in obscurity at Anagni. He then returned to Rome, a youth of great beauty, with a smile which gave a peculiar and remarkable expression to his countenance. He married the daughter of a burgher, who brought him a dowry of 150 golden florins; he had three children, one son and two daughters. He embraced the profession of a notary. But his chief occupation was poring over those sacred antiquities of Rome, which exercised so powerful an influence on his mind. Rome had already welcomed the first dawn of those classical studies, publicly, proudly, in the coronation of Petrarch.¹ The respect for the ancient monuments of Rome, and for her famous writers, which the great poet had endeavored to inculcate by his language and by his example, crept into the depths of Rienzi's soul. The old historian, Fortefiocca, gives as his favorite authors, Livy, Cicero, Seneca, Valerius Maximus; but "the magnificent deeds and words of the great Cæsar were his chief delight." His leisure was passed among the stupendous and yet august remains, the ruins, or as yet hardly ruins, of elder Rome. He was not less deeply impregnated with the Biblical language and religious imagery of his day, though he declares that his meditations on the profound subjects of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate, were not drawn from the holy wisdom of Gregory or Augustine; but were droppings from the less deep and transparent springs of the Roman patricians, Boetius and Symmachus, Livy,

story. The mother of Rienzi, he says, was reported to be the daughter of a bastard of King Henry. This could not be. The whole is in the *Urkunde* of Dr. Papencordt, p. xxxii.

¹ Apud Muratori, R. I. S.

Cicero, and Seneca. Even now a religious has begun to mingle with the Roman fanaticism of the youth.

Already too had Rienzi learned to contrast the miserable and servile state of his countrymen with that of their free and glorious ancestors. "Where are those old Romans? Where their justice? Would that I had lived in their times!"¹ The sense of personal wrong was wrought up with these more lofty and patriotic feelings. His younger brother was murdered; and Rienzi, unable to obtain redress from the partial and disdainful justice of the nobles, vowed vengeance for the innocent blood. And already had he assumed the office of champion of the poor. As the heads of the mercantile guilds, or the Roman Schools, called themselves by the proud name of Consuls, so Rienzi took the title of Consul of the orphans, the widows, and the indigent.

Rienzi must have attained some fame, or some notoriety, to have been either alone or among the delegates of the people sent on the public mission to Clement VI. at Avignon.² These ambassadors were instructed to make three demands, some of them peremptory, of the Pope: — I. To confirm the magistracy appointed by the Romans. II. To entreat his Holiness at least to revisit Rome. III. To appoint the Jubilee for every fiftieth year. The eloquence of Rienzi so charmed the Pope that he desired to hear him every day. He intralled the admiration of a

¹ The passage is quoted by Papencordt.

² There seem to have been two embassies, successive or simultaneous, one headed by Stephen Colonna, and two other nobles, with Petrarch; another (perhaps later), in which Rienzi signed himself "*Nicolaus Laurentii, Romanus, consul orphanorum viduarum et pauperum, unicus popularis legatus.*" — Hobhouse, "*Illustrations of Childe Harold.*"

greater than the Pope: Petrarch here learned to know him whose fame was to be the subject of one of his noblest odes.¹

Rienzi wrote in triumph to Rome.² The Pope had acceded to two of the demands of the people: he had granted the Jubilee on the fiftieth year; he had promised, when the affairs of Rome should permit, to revisit Rome. Rienzi calls on the mountains around, and on the hills and plains, to break out into joy. "May the Roman city arise from her long prostration, ascend the throne of her majesty, cast off the garment of her widowhood, and put on the bridal purple. Let the crown of liberty adorn her head, and rings of gold her neck; let her reassume the sceptre of justice; and, regenerate in every virtue, go forth in her wedding attire to meet her bridegroom. . . . Behold the most merciful Lamb of God that confoundeth sin! The most Holy Pontiff, the father of the city, the bridegroom of the Lord, moved by the cries and complaints and wailings of his bride, compassionating her sufferings, her calamities, and her ruin — astonished at the regeneration of the city, the glory of the people, the joy and salvation of the world — by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost — opening the bosom of his clemency — has pledged himself to have mercy upon us, and promises grace and redemption to the whole world, and to the nations remission of sins." After all this vague and high-flown Scriptural imagery, Rienzi passes to his classical reminiscences: — "What Scipio, what Cæsar,

¹ The "*Spirto gentil*." I cannot doubt that this canzone was addressed to Rienzi.

² These letters were published from the Turin MSS. by Mr. Hobhouse (Lord Broughton), in his "*Illustrations of Childe Harold*."

or Metellus, or Marcellus, or Fabius, can be so fairly deemed the deliverer of their country, or so justly honored with a statue? They won hard victories by the calamities of war, by the bloodshed of citizens: he, unsolicited, by one holy and triumphant word, has achieved a victory over the present and future disasters of his country, reëstablished the Roman commonwealth, and rescued the despairing people from death."

Whether Pope Clement was conscious that he was deluding the ardent Rienzi with false hopes, while the eloquence of Rienzi palled in the ears of the French Papal Court; whether Rienzi betrayed his suspicions of the Pope's sincerity, or the Cardinal Colonna became jealous of his influence with the Pope, he soon fell into disfavor. At Avignon he was reduced to great poverty, and, probably from illness, was glad to take refuge in a hospital.¹ The Cardinal, however, perhaps from contemptuous compassion, reconciled him with the Pope. Rienzi returned to Rome with the appointment of Notary in the Papal Court, and a flattering testimonial to his character, as a man zealous for the welfare of the city.

At Rome, Rienzi executed his office of Notary by deputy, and confined himself to his studies, ^{Rienzi in Rome.} and to his profound and rankling meditations on the miseries and oppressions of the people. The luxury of the nobles was without check: the lives of the men and the honor of the women seemed to be yielded up to their caprice and their lust. All this Rienzi attributed, in a great degree, to the criminal abandonment of his flock by the Supreme Pontiff. "Would that our pastor had been content with this

¹ Forteflocca, apud Muratori.

scandal alone, that he should dwell in Avignon, having deserted his flock! But far worse than this: he nurses, cherishes, and favors those very wolves, the fear of which, as he pretends, keeps him away from Rome, that their teeth and their talons may be stronger to devour his sheep. On the Orsini, on the Colonnas, and on the other nobles whom he knows to be infamous as public robbers, the destroyers, both spiritual and temporal, of his holy episcopal city, and the devourers of his own peculiar flock, he confers dignities and honors; he even bestows on them rich prelacies, in order that they may wage those wars which they have not wealth enough to support, from the treasures of the Church; and when he has been perpetually entreated by the people that, as a compassionate father, he would at least appoint some good man, a foreigner, as ruler over his episcopal city, he would never consent; but, in contempt of the petitions of the people, he placed the sword in the hands of some madman, and invested the tyrants of the people with the authority of Senators, for the sole purpose, as it is credibly known and proved, that the Roman flock, thus 'preyed on by ravening wolves, should not have strength or courage to demand the residence of their Pastor in his episcopal seat.'¹

Rienzi, thus despairing of all alleviation of the calamities of the people from the ecclesiastical power, sat brooding over his hopes of reawakening the old Roman spirit of liberty. In this high design he proceeded with wonderful courage, address, and resolution. He submitted to every kind of indignity, and assumed

¹ Thus he wrote later to the Archbishop of Prague. — Papencordt, *Urkunde*, p. xliv.

every disguise which might advance his end. He stooped to be admitted as a buffoon to amuse, rather than as a companion to enlighten, the haughty nobles in the Colonna Palace. He has been called the modern Brutus:¹ he alleges higher examples. "I confess that, drunken after the parching fever of my soul, in order to put down the predominant injustice, and to persuade the people to union, I often feigned and dissembled; made myself a simpleton and a stage-player; was by turns serious or silly, cunning, earnest, and timid, as occasion required, to promote my work of love. David danced before the ark, and appeared as a madman before the King; Judith stood before Holofernes, bland, crafty, and dissembling; and Jacob obtained his blessing by cunning: so I, when I took up the cause of the people against their worst tyrants, had to deal with no frank and open antagonists, but with men of shifts and wiles, the subtlest and most deceitful." Once in the assembly of the people he was betrayed by his indignation into a premature appeal to their yet unawakened sympathies. He reproached his fellow representatives with their disregard of the sufferings of the people, and ventured to let loose his eloquence on the blessings of good order. The only answer was a blow from a Norman kinsman of the Colonnas; in the simple language of the historian, a box on the ear that rang again.²

Allegorical picture was the language of the times. The Church had long employed it to teach or to enforce Christian truth or Christian obedience among the rude and unlettered people. It had certainly been

¹ By Gibbon. See *Urkunde*, p. xlix.

² "Un sonante gotata." — *Fortefiocca*.

used for political purposes.¹ Dante may show how completely the Italian mind must have been familiarized with this suggestive imagery. Many of the great names of the time — the Orsini, the Mastini, the Cani, the Lucchi — either lent themselves to or grew out of this verbal symbolism. Rienzi seized on the yet unrestricted freedom of painting, as a modern demagogue might on the freedom of the press, to instil his own feelings of burning shame at the common degradation and oppression. All the historians have dwelt on the masterpiece of his pictorial eloquence: — On a sinking ship, without mast or sail, sat a noble lady in widow's weeds, with dishevelled hair and her hands crossed over her breast. Above was written, "This is Rome." She was surrounded by four other ships, in which sat women who personated Babylon, Carthage, Tyre, Jerusalem. "Through unrighteousness," ran the legend, "these fell to ruin." An inscription hung above, "Thou, O Rome, art exalted above all; we await thy downfall." Three islands appeared beside the ship: in one was Italy, in another four of the cardinal virtues, in the third Christian Faith. Each had its appropriate inscription. Over Faith was written, "O highest Father, Ruler, and Lord! when Rome sinks, where find I refuge?" Bitter satire was not wanting. Four rows of winged beasts stood above, who blew their horns, and directed the pitiless storm against the sinking vessel. The lions, wolves, and bears denoted, as the legend explained, the mighty barons and traitorous senators; the dogs, the swine, and the bulls, were the counsellors, the base partisans of the nobles; the sheep, the serpents, and foxes,

Allegorical
painting.

¹ Dr. Papencordt cites many examples.

were the officers, the false judges, and notaries; the hares, cats, goats, and apes, the robbers, murderers, adulterers, thieves, among the people. Above was, "God in his majesty come down to judgment, with two swords, as in the Apocalypse, out of his mouth." St. Peter and St. Paul were beneath, on either side, in the attitude of supplication.

Rienzi describes another of his well-known attempts to work upon the populace, and to impress them with the sense of the former greatness of Rome.¹ The great bronze tablet² containing the decree by which the Senate conferred the Empire upon Vespasian, had been employed by Boniface VIII., out of jealousy to the Emperor, as Rienzi asserts,³ to form part of an altar in the Lateran Church, with the inscription turned inward, so that it could not be read. Rienzi brought forth this tablet, placed it on a kind of high scaffold in the Church, and summoned the people to a lecture on its meaning,⁴ in which he enlarged on the former power and dominion of Rome.⁵

Rienzi's hour came at length. Throughout his acts the ancient traditions of Pagan Rome min- Feb. 18.
gled with the religious observances of the Christian capital. The day after Ash Wednesday (A.D. 1347) a scroll appeared on the doors of the Church of St.

¹ Letter to the Archbishop of Prague, in Papencordt.

² The *lex regia*, Imperium. This tablet is still in the Capitoline Museum.

³ This was written when Rienzi's object was to obtain favor with the Emperor (Charles) at the expense of the Pope.

⁴ This probably was somewhat later.

⁵ It was in this speech that he made the whimsical antiquarian blunder, which Gibbon takes credit for detecting. He rendered "*pomærium*," of which he did not know the meaning, as "*pomarium*," and made Italy the garden of Rome.

George in Velabro: "Erelong Rome will return to her good estate." Nightly meetings were held on the Aventine (Rienzi may have learned from Meeting on the Aventine. Livy the secession of the people to that hill). Rienzi spoke with his most impassioned eloquence. He compared the misery, slavery, debasement of Rome, with her old glory, liberty, universal dominion. He wept; his hearers mingled their tears with his. He summoned them to freedom. There could be no want of means; the revenue of the city amounted to 300,000 golden florins. He more than hinted that the Pope would not disapprove of their proceedings. All swore a solemn oath of freedom.

May 20.
Revolution. On the Vigil of Pentecost, the festival of the Effusion of the Holy Ghost, the Roman people were summoned by the sound of trumpet to appear unarmed at the Capitol on the following day. All that night Rienzi was hearing, in the Church of St. Angelo, the Thirty Masses of the Holy Ghost. "It was the Holy Ghost that inspired this holy deed." At ten o'clock in the morning he came forth from the Church in full armor, with his head bare: twenty-five of the sworn conspirators were around him. Three banners went before—the banner of freedom, borne by Cola Guallato, on which appeared, on a red ground, Rome seated on her twin lions, with the globe and the palm-branch in her hand. The second was white; on it St. Paul with the sword and diadem of justice: it was borne by the Notary, Stefanello Magnacuccia. On the third was St. Peter with the keys. By the side of Rienzi was Raimond, Bishop of Orvieto, the Pope's Vicar: around was a guard of one hundred horsemen. Amid the acclamations of the thronging multitudes

they ascended the Capitol. The Count di Cecco Mancino was commanded to read the Laws of the Good Estate. These laws had something of the wild justice of wild times. All causes were to be determined within fourteen days ; every murderer was to suffer death, the false accuser the punishment of the crime charged against the innocent man. No house was to be pulled down ; those that fell escheated to the State. Each Rione (there were thirteen) was to maintain one hundred men on foot, twenty-five horse : these received a shield and moderate pay from the State ; if they fell in the public service, their heirs received, those of the foot one hundred livres, of the horse one hundred florins. The treasury of the State was charged with the support of widows, orphans, convents. Each Rione was to have its granary for corn ; the revenues of the city, the hearth-money, salt-tax, tolls on bridges and wharves, were to be administered for the public good. The fortresses, bridges, gates, were no longer to be guarded by the Barons, but by Captains chosen by the people. No Baron might possess a stronghold within the city ; all were to be surrendered to the magistrates. The Barons were to be responsible, under a penalty of one thousand marks of silver, for the security of the roads around the city. The people shouted their assent to the new constitution. The senators Agapito Colonna, Robert Orsini, were ignominiously dismissed. Rienzi was invested in dictatorial power — power over life and limb, power to pardon, power to establish the Good Estate in Rome and her domain. A few days later he took the title of Tribune. “Nicolas, by the grace of Jesus Christ, the Severe and Merciful, Tribune of Freedom, Peace, and Justice, the Deliverer of the Roman Republic.”

The nobles, either stunned by this unexpected revolution, of which they had despised the signs and omens, or divided among themselves, looked on in wondering and sullen apathy. Some even professed to disdain it as some new public buffoonery of Rienzi. The old Stephen Colonna was opportunely absent from the city; on his return he answered to the summons of the Tribune, "Tell the fool that if he troubles me with his insolence, I will throw him from the windows of the Capitol!" The tolling of the bell of the Capitol replied to the haughty noble. Rome in all her quarters was in arms. Colonna fled with difficulty to one of his strongholds near Palestrina. The younger Stephen Colonna appeared in arms with his partisans before the Capitol, where the Tribune was seated on the bench of justice. The Tribune advanced in arms to meet him. Colonna, either overawed, or with some respect for the Roman liberty, swore on the Holy Eucharist to take no hostile measure against the Good Estate. All the Colonnas, the Orsini, the Savelli, were compelled to yield up their fortress-palaces, to make oath that they would protect no robbers or malefactors, to keep the roads secure, to supply provisions to the city, to appear in arms or without arms at the summons of the magistracy. All orders of the city took the same oath—clergy, gentry, judges, notaries, merchants, shopkeepers, artisans: they swore to maintain the laws of the Good Estate.

Within fifteen days, so boasts Rienzi, the old, inveterate pride of this barbarous Patriciate was prostrate at the feet of the Tribune. History may record in his own words the rapidity with which he achieved this wonderful victory. "By the Divine grace

Awe of the
Nobles.

Their sub-
mission.

no King, or Duke, or Prince, or Marquis in Italy ever surpassed me in the shortness of the time in which I rose to legitimate power, and earned fame which reached even to the Saracens. It was achieved in seven months, a period which would hardly suffice for a king to subdue one of the Roman nobles. On the first day of my tribunate (an office which, from the time that the Empire sank into decrepitude, had been vacant under tyrannical rule for more than five hundred years) I, for God was with me, scattered with my consuming breath before my face, or rather before the face of God, all these nobles, these haters of God and of justice. And thus, in truth, on the day of Pentecost, was that word fulfilled which is chanted on that day in honor of the Holy Ghost, 'Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered,' and again, 'Send forth thy Holy Ghost, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.' Certainly hitherto no Pontiff or Emperor had been able to expel the nobles from the city, who had in general rather triumphed over than submitted to Popes and Emperors; and yet these nobles, thus terribly expelled and exiled, when I cited them to appear again in fifteen days, I had prostrate at my feet, swearing obedience to my decrees."¹ The old historian, in his own graphic phrase, confirms the words of Rienzi, "How stood they trembling with fear."²

The primary laws of the new Republic had provided for financial reforms. The taxes became more productive, less onerous: the salt duty alone increased five or six fold. The constitution had regulated the military organization. At the sound of the bell of the Capitol appeared in arms from the thirteen Rioni of the city

¹ Urkunde, xxxiv.

² "Deh che stavano paurosi!"

three hundred and sixty horse, thirteen hundred foot. The open, patient, inexorable justice of Rienzi respected not, it delighted to humiliate, the haughtiest of the nobles. It extended not only throughout the city, but to all the country around. The woods rejoiced that they concealed no robbers; the oxen ploughed the field undisturbed; the pilgrims crowded without fear to the shrines of the saints and the apostles; the traders might leave their precious wares by the roadside in perfect safety; tyrants trembled; good men rejoiced at their emancipation from slavery.¹ The Tribune's hand fell heavily on the great

Justice of
Rienzi.

houses. Petruccio Frangipani, Lord of Civita Lavigna, and Luca Savelli, were thrown into prison; the Colonnas and the Orsini bowed for a time their proud heads; the chief of the Orsini was condemned for neglecting the protection of the highways; a mule laden with oil had been stolen. Peter Agapito Colonna, the deposed senator, was arrested for some crime in the public streets.² Rome was summoned to witness the ignominious execution of Martino Gaetani, nephew of two Cardinals, but newly married, for the robbery of a stranded ship at the mouth of the Tiber. The Tribune spared not the sacred persons of the clergy: a monk of St. Anastasio was hanged for many crimes. Rienzi boasted that he had wrought a moral as well as a civil revolution. All who had been banished since 1340 were recalled, and pledged to live in peace. "It was hardly to be believed that the Roman people, till now full of dissension and corrupted by every kind of vice, should be so soon reduced to a state of unanimity, to so great

¹ Urkunde.

² Forteflocca, p. 41.

a love of justice, virtue, and peace; that hatred, assaults, murder, and rapine should be subdued and put an end to. There is now no person in the city who dares to play at forbidden games or blasphemously to invoke God and his saints; there is no layman who keeps his concubine; all enemies are reconciled; even wives who had been long cast off return to their husbands.”¹

The magic effect of the Tribune's sudden apparition at the head of a new Roman Republic, which seemed to aspire to the sway of ancient Rome over Italy, if not over all the world, is thus glowingly described in his own language: this shows at least the glorious ends of Rienzi's ambition. “Did I not restore peace among the cities which were distracted by factions? Did I not decree that all the citizens who were banished by party violence, with their wretched wives and children, should be readmitted? Had I not begun to extinguish the party names of Guelf and Ghibelline, for which numberless victims had perished body and soul, and to reduce the city of Rome and all Italy into one harmonious, peaceful, holy confederacy? The sacred standards and banners of all the cities were gathered, and, as a testimony to our hallowed association, consecrated and offered with their golden rings on the day of the Assumption of our Blessed Lady. . . . I received the homage and submission of the Counts and Barons, and almost all the people of Italy. I was honored by solemn embassies and letters from the Emperor of Constantinople and the King of England. The Queen of Naples submitted herself and her kingdom to the pro-

¹ Letter to a friend at Avignon, from the Turin MS. — Hobhouse, p. 537.

tection of the Tribune. The King of Hungary, by two stately embassies, with great urgency brought his cause against the Queen and her nobles before my tribunal. And I venture to say further that the fame of the Tribune alarmed the Soldan of Babylon. The Christian pilgrims to the sepulchre of our Lord related all the wonderful and unheard-of circumstances of the reformation in Rome to the Christian and Jewish inhabitants of Jerusalem; both Christians and Jews celebrated the event with unusual festivities. When the Soldan inquired the cause of these rejoicings, and received this answer about Rome, he ordered all the towns and cities on the coast to be fortified and put in a state of defence.”¹

Nor was this altogether an idle boast. The rival Emperors Louis of Bavaria and Charles of Bohemia regarded not his summons to submit their differences to the arbitration of Rome. But before the judgment-seat of Rienzi stood the representatives of Louis of Hungary, of Queen Joanna of Naples and Louis Prince of Tarento, the husband of the Queen, and of Charles of Durazzo who claimed the throne in right of his wife, Joanna's sister. They were prepared to obey the award of the Tribune, who applied to himself the words of the Psalm, “He shall judge the people in equity.” An Archbishop pleaded before the tribunal of Rienzi. The kingdom of Naples, held in fee, as long asserted, of the Pope, seemed to submit itself to the Seignioralty of the Tribune of Rome.

It is impossible to determine whether, as Rienzi him-

¹ I have put together two passages; the latter from his letter to the Emperor. — Papencordt, Urkunde.

self in one place admits, it was mere vanity or a vague and not impolitic desire to gather round his own name all the glorious reminiscences of every period of Roman history, and so to rivet his power on the minds of men, which induced Rienzi to accumulate on himself so many lofty but discordant appellations. The Roman Republic, the Roman Empire in its periods of grandeur and of decline, the Church, and the Chivalry of the middle ages, were blended together in the strange pomp of his ceremonies and the splendid array of his titles. He was the Tribune of the people to remind them of the days of their liberty. He called himself Augustus, and chose to be crowned in the month of August, because that month was called after the "great Emperor, the conqueror of Cleopatra."¹ He called himself Severe, not merely to awe the noble malecontents with the stern terrors of his justice, but in respect to the philosopher, the last of the Romans, Severinus Boethius. He was knighted according to the full ceremonial of chivalry, having bathed in the porphyry vessel in which, according to the legend, Pope Sylvester cleansed Constantine the Great of his leprosy. Among the banners which he bestowed on the cities of Italy, which did him a kind of homage, that of Perugia was inscribed "Long live the citizens of Perugia and the memory of Constantine." Sienna received the arms of the Tribune and those of Rome, the wolf and her twin founders. Florence had the banner of Italy, in which Rome was represented between two other females, designating Italy and the Christian faith.

Rienzi professed the most profound respect for relig-

¹ Urkunde, xi. and xlv.

ion ; throughout he endeavored to sanction and hallow his proceedings by the ceremonial of the Church. He professed the most submissive reverence for the Pope. The Papal Vicar, the Bishop of Orvieto, a vain, weak man, was flattered by the idle honor of being his associate without any power in the government. Though many of the Tribune's measures encroached boldly on the prerogatives of the Pontiff, yet he was inclined, as far as possible, to encourage the notion that his rise and his power were, if not authorized, approved by his Holiness. He asserts, indeed, that he was the greatest bulwark of the Church. "Who, in the memory of man, among all the sovereigns of Rome or of Italy, ever showed greater love for ecclesiastical persons, or so strictly protected ecclesiastical rights? Did I not, above all things, respect monasteries, hospitals, and other temples of God, and, whenever complaint was made, enforce the peaceful restitution of all their estates and properties of which they had been despoiled by the Nobles? This restitution they could never obtain by all the Bulls and Charters of the Supreme Pontiff; and now that I am deposed, they deplore all their former losses. I wish that the Supreme Pontiff would condescend to promote me or put me to death, according to the judgment of all religious persons, of the monks, and the whole clergy." The Tribune's language, asserting himself to be under the special influence of the Holy Ghost, which from the first awoke the jealousy of the Pope, he explains away, with more ingenuity, perhaps, than ingenuousness.¹ "No power but that of the Spirit of God could have united the turbulent and dissolute Roman people

¹ Written to the Archbishop of Prague.

in his favor. It was their unity, not his words and actions, which manifestly displayed the presence of the Holy Ghost." At all events, in the proudest days of his ceremonial, especially on that of his coronation with the seven crowns, all the most distinguished clergy of Rome did not scruple to officiate.

These days, the 1st and the 15th of August, beheld Rienzi at the height of his power and splendor. Roman tradition hallowed, and still hallows, the 1st of August as the birthday of the empire: on that day Octavius took Alexandria, and ended the civil war. It became a Christian, it is still a popular, festival.¹ On the vigil of that day set forth a procession to the Lateran Church—the Church of Constantine the Great. It was headed by the wife of Rienzi, her mother, with 500 ladies, escorted by 200 horsemen. Then came Rienzi with his iron staff, as a sceptre; by his side the Pope's Vicar. The naked sword glittered and the banner of the city waved over his head. The ambassadors of twenty-six cities were present; those of Perugia and Corneto stripped off their splendid upper garments and threw them to the mob. That night Rienzi passed in the church, in the holy preparations for his knighthood. The porphyry font or vessel in which Constantine, in one legend was baptized, in another cleansed from the leprosy, was his bath. In the morning, proclamation was made in the name of Nicolas, the Severe and Merciful, the Deliverer of the City, the Zealot for the freedom of Italy, the Friend of the World, the August Tribune. It asserted the ancient indefeasible title of Rome as the head of the

¹ It is still called *Felicissimo Feraugusto*. Murator., *Ant. Ital. diss. lxx. tom. v. 12.* Niebuhr in *Roms Beschreibung*, iii. 2, 235.

world and the foundation of the Christian faith, to universal sovereignty; the liberty of all the cities of Italy, which were admitted to the rights of Roman citizenship. Through this power, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, Rome had the sole prerogative of the election of the Emperor. It summoned all Prelates, Emperors elect or Kings, Dukes, Princes, and Nobles, who presumed to contest that right, to appear in Rome at the ensuing Pentecost. It summoned specially the high Princes, Louis Duke of Bavaria and Charles King of Bohemia, the Dukes of Austria and Saxony, the Elector Palatine, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, Trèves. Though the proclamation seemed to save the honor of the Pope and the Cardinals, the Pope's Vicar attempted to interpose; his voice was drowned in the blare of the trumpets and the shouts of the multitude. In the evening there was a splendid banquet in the Lateran Palace. Tournaments and dances delighted the people. The horse of the famous statue of Marcus Aurelius poured wine from his nostrils. The cities presented sumptuous gifts of horses, mules, gold, silver, precious stones.

The pride of Rienzi was not yet at its full. Four-
teen days after, on the Feast of the Assump-
tion of the Virgin, there was another cer-
emony in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore. Seven
distinguished ecclesiastics or nobles placed seven crowns
on the head of the Tribune, of oak, ivy, myrtle, laurel,
olive, silver, gold. Of these the laurel crown had the
emblems of religion, justice, peace, humility. Together
the seven crowns symbolized the seven gifts of the Holy
Ghost. The Tribune spoke, and among his words
were these: "As Christ in his thirty-third year, hav-

Aug. 15.
Coronation
of Rienzi.

ing overthrown the tyrants of Hell, went up crowned into Heaven, so God willed that in the same year of my life,¹ I, having conquered the tyrants of the city without a blow, and alone given liberty to the people, should be promoted to the laurel crown of the Tribune." This was the day of his highest magnificence. Never, he confesses in his humiliation, was he environed with so much pomp or elated by so much pride. It was now, after he had made the profane comparison between himself and the Lord, that was uttered the awful prediction of his downfall.² In the midst of the wild and joyous exultation of the people, one of his most zealous supporters, Fra Gulielmo, in high repute for sanctity, stood aloof in a corner of the church, and wept bitterly. A domestic chaplain of Rienzi inquired the cause of his sorrow. "Now," replied the servant of God, "is thy master cast down ^{Prophecy of his fall.} from Heaven. Never saw I man so proud! By the aid of the Holy Ghost he has driven the tyrants from the city without drawing a sword; the cities and the sovereigns of Italy have acknowledged his power. Why is he so arrogant and ungrateful against the Most High? Why does he seek earthly and transitory rewards for his labors, and in wanton speech liken himself to the Creator? Tell thy master that he can atone for this only by streams of penitential tears." In the evening the chaplain communicated this solemn rebuke to the Tribune: it appalled him for a time, but was soon forgotten in the tumult and hurry of business.

¹ This is at variance with the story of his imperial birth. Henry of Luxemburg was in Rome in May and June, 1312. In Aug. 1347, Rienzi would have been in his 34th or 35th year.

² See the letter to the Archbishop of Prague in Papencordt.

Power had intoxicated Rienzi ; but the majestic edifice which he had built was based on a quicksand. In the people this passion of virtue was too violent to last ; they were accustomed to paroxysmal bursts of liberty. It would indeed have been a social and religious miracle if the Romans, after centuries of misrule, degradation, slavery, superstition, had suddenly appeared worthy of freedom ; or able to maintain and wisely and moderately to enjoy the blessings of a just and equal civilization. They had lived too long in the malaria of servitude. Of the old vigorous plebeian Roman, they had nothing but the turbulence ; the frugality, the fortitude, the discipline, the love of order, and respect for law, are virtues of slow growth. They had been depressed too long, too low. If victims of the profligacy and tyranny of the nobles, submission to such outrages, however reluctant, however cast off in an access of indignation, is no school of high and enduring dignity of morals, that only safeguard of sound republican institutions. The number, wealth, license of the Roman clergy were even more fatally corruptive. Still, as for centuries, the Romans were a fierce, fickle populace. Nor was Rienzi himself, though his morals were blameless, though he incurred no charge of avarice or rapacity, a model of the sterner republican virtues. He wanted simplicity, solidity, self-command. His ostentation, in some respects politic, became puerile. His processions, of which himself was still the centre, at first excited, at length palled on the popular feeling. His luxury — for his table became sumptuous, his dress, his habits splendid — was costly, burdensome to the people, as well as offensive and invidious ; the advancement of his family, the rock

Roman
people.

on which demagogues constantly split, unwise. Even his religion, the indispensable, dominant influence in such times, was showy and theatrical; it wanted that depth and fervor which spreads by contagion, hurries away, and binds to blind obedience its unthinking partisans. Fanaticism brooks no rivals in the human heart. From the first the Papal Court had watched the proceedings of Rienzi with sullen jealousy. There was cold reserve in their approbation, or rather in the suspension of their condemnation: an evident determination not to commit themselves. Rienzi was in the same letter the humble servant, the imperious dictator to the Pope. As his power increased, their suspicions darkened; the influence of his enemies at Avignon became more formidable. And when the courtiers of Papal court, the papal chamber, the clergy, especially the French clergy, the Cardinals, almost all French, who preferred the easy and luxurious life at Avignon to a disturbed and dangerous residence at Rome (perhaps with a severe republican censorship over their morals); when all these heard it not obscurely intimated that the Tribune would refuse obedience to any Pope who would not fix his seat in Rome, the intrigues became more active, the Pope and his representatives more openly adverse to the new order of things. Petrarch speaks of the poison of deep hatred which had infected the souls of the courtiers; they looked with the blackest jealousy on the popularity and fame of Rome and Italy.¹ The Cardinal Talleyrand Perigord was furious at the interposition of Rienzi in the affairs of Naples. The Nobles of Rome had powerful relatives at Avignon. The Cardinal Colonna brought dangerous charges

¹ Petrarch, Epist. sine titulo.

against Rienzi, not less dangerous because untrue, of heresy,¹ even of unlawful and magical arts.

Power had intoxicated Rienzi, but it had not inspired him with the daring recklessness which often accompanies that intoxication, and is almost necessary to the permanence of power. In the height of his pride he began to betray pusillanimity, or worse. He could condescend to treachery to bring his enemies within his grasp, but hesitated to crush them when beneath his feet. Twice again the Tribune triumphed over the Nobles, by means not to be expected from Rienzi, once by perfidy, once by force of arms. The Nobles, Colonnas and Orsinis, had returned to Rome. They seemed to have sunk from the tyrants into the legitimate aristocracy in rank of the new republic. They had taken the oath to the Constitution, the old Stephen and the young John Colonna, Rinaldo and Giordano Orsini. At the Tribune's command the armorial bearings had vanished from the haughty portals of Colonnas, Orsinis, Savellis!² No one was to be called Lord but the Pope. They were loaded with praise, with praise bordering on adulation, by the Tribune, not with praise only, with favor. A Colonna and an Orsini were intrusted with, and accepted, the command of the forces raised to subdue the two tyrants, who held out in the Campagna, John de Vico, the lord of Viterbo, in the strong castle of Respampano, and Gaetano Cercano, lord of Fondi. Nicolas Orsini, Captain of the Castle of St. Angelo with Giordano Orsini, commanded against John de Vico.

¹ Rienzi's constant appeal to the Holy Ghost would sound peculiarly akin to the prophetic visions of the Fraticelli.

² All this he commanded, "e fo fatto." Compare Du Cerceau, *Vie de Rienzi*, p. 93.

On a sudden (it was a month after the last August festivity), Rome heard that all these nobles ^{Arrest of Nobles.} had been arrested, and were in the prisons of the Tribune. Rienzi has told the history of the event.¹ "Having entertained some suspicion" (he might perhaps entertain suspicion on just grounds, but he deigns not to state them) "of designs among the nobles against myself and against the people; it pleased God that they fell into my hands." It was an act of the basest treachery! He invited them to a banquet. They came, the old Stephen Colonna, Peter Aga- ^{Sept. 14.} pito Colonna, lord of Genazzano (once senator), John Colonna, who had commanded the troops against the Count of Fondi; John of the Mountain, Rinaldo of Marino, Count Berthold, and his sons, the Captain of the Castle of St. Angelo, all Orsinis. Luca Savelli, the young Stephen Colonna, Giordano Marini alone lay hid or escaped. The Tribune's suspicions were confirmed. Thus writes Rienzi: "I adopted an innocent artifice to reconcile them not only with myself but with God; I procured them the inestimable blessing of making a devout confession." The Confessor, ignorant of the Tribune's merciful designs, prepared them for death. It happened that just at the moment the bell was tolling for the assembly of the people in the Capitol. The Nobles, supposing it the death-knell for their execution, confessed with the profoundest penitence and sorrow.

¹ This letter was translated with tolerable accuracy, by Du Cerceau, from Hoessemius (in Chapeaville, Hist. Episcop. Leodens.). It was addressed to an Orsini, canon of Liege. Gibbon, who had not seen the original, observes on it, that it displays in genuine colors the mixture of the knave and the madman. It was obviously meant to be communicated to the Pope.

In the assembly of the people, Rienzi suddenly veered round: not only did he pardon, he propitiated the people towards the Nobles; he heaped praise upon them; he restored their honors and offices of trust.

Sept. 17. He made them swear another oath of fidelity to the Holy Church, to the people, and to himself; to maintain against all foes the Good Estate. They took the Blessed Sacrament together.

Rienzi must have strangely deluded himself, if he conceived that he could impose upon Rome, upon the Pope, and upon the Cardinals by this assertion of religious solicitude for the captive nobles; still more if he could bind them to fidelity by this ostentatious show of mercy. Contemptuous pardon is often the most galling and inexpressible insult. His show of magnanimity could not cancel his treachery. He obtained no credit for sparing his enemies, either from his enemies themselves or from the world. The Nobles remembered only that he had steeped them to the lips in humiliation, and brooded on vengeance. Both ascribed his abstaining from blood to cowardice. The times speak in Petrarch. The gentle and high-souled poet betrays his unfeigned astonishment at the weakness of Rienzi; that when his enemies were under his feet, he not merely spared their lives (that clemency might have done), but left such public parricides the power to become again dangerous foes of the state.¹

The poet was no bad seer. In two months the Colonnas, the Orsinis were in arms. From their fastnesses in Palestrina and Marino they were threatening the city. The character of Rienzi rose not with the danger. He had no military skill; he had not even the

¹ Petrarch's letter, quoted p. lxxix. of Papencordt's *Urkunde*.

courage of a soldier. Nothing less than extraordinary accident, and the senseless imprudence of his adversaries, gave him a victory as surprising to himself as to others; and his mind, which had ^{Defeat of the Colonnas.} been pitifully depressed by adversity, was ^{Nov. 22.}

altogether overthrown by unexpected, undeserved success. The young and beautiful John Colonna had striven to force his way into the gates; he fell; the father, at the sight of his maimed and mangled body, checked the attack in despair. All was panic; four Colonnas perished in the battle or the flight; eighteen others of the noblest names, Orsinis, Frangipanis, Savellis, the lords of Civita Vecchia, Viterbo, Toscanella.¹ Rienzi tarnished his fame by insulting the remains of the dead. His sprinkling his son Lorenzo with the water tainted by the blood of his enemies, and saluting him as Knight of Victory, was an outburst of pride and vengeance which shocked his most ardent admirers.²

Rienzi might seem by this victory, however obtained, by the death of the Colonnas, the captivity of his other foes, secure at the height of his greatness. Not a month has passed; he is a lonely exile. Everything seems suddenly, unaccountably, desperately to break down beneath him; the bubble of his glory bursts, and becomes thin air.

Rienzi must speak again. He had dark and inward presentiments of his approaching fall. The ^{Rienzi's prostration of mind.} prophecy at his coronation recurred in all its terrors to his mind, for the same Fra Gulielmo had

¹ See the list of the slain and prisoners in Rienzi's account. — Papenordt, note, p. 182.

² Read in Hocsemius (p. 506), or in Du Cerceau (p. 222), his letter of triumph: "This is the day that the Lord hath made."

foretold the death of the Colonnas by his hand and by the judgment of God. The latter prophecy the Tribune had communicated to many persons; and when the four chiefs of that house fell under the walls of Rome, the people believed in a Divine revelation. His enemies asserted that Rienzi kept, in the cross of his sceptre, an unclean spirit who foretold future events. (This had been already denounced to the Pope.) "When I had obtained the victory," he proceeds, "and in the opinion of men my power might seem fixed on the most solid foundation, my greatness of mind sank away, and a sudden timidity came over me so frequently, that I awoke at night, and cried out that the armed enemy was breaking into my palace; and although what I say may seem ludicrous, the night-bird called the owl took the place of the dove on the pinnacle of the palace, and, though constantly scared away by my domestics, as constantly flew back, and for twelve nights kept me without sleep by its lamentable hootings. And thus he whom the fury of the Roman nobles and the array of his armed foes could not alarm, lay shuddering at visions and the screams of night-birds. Weakened by want of sleep, and these perpetual terrors, I was no longer fit to bear arms or give audience to the people."¹

To this prostration of mind Rienzi attributes his hasty desperate abandonment of his power. But there were other causes. The Pope had at length declared against him in the strongest terms. During the last period of his power Rienzi had given many grounds for suspicion that he intended to assume the empire. He had asserted the choice of the Emperor to be in the

¹ From the same letter.

Roman people; though in his condescension he had offered a share in this great privilege to the cities of Italy. The bathing in the porphyry vessel of Constantine was not forgotten. When the Papal Legate, Bertrand de Deux, had appeared in Rome to condemn his proceedings and to depose him from his power, Rienzi returned from his camp near Marino (he was then engaged against John de Vico), and confronted the Legate clad in the Dalmatica, the imperial mantle worn at the coronation of the Emperors, which he had taken from the sacristy of St. Peter's. The Legate, appalled at the demeanor of the Tribune and the martial music which clanged around him, could not utter a word. Rienzi turned his back contemptuously, and returned to his camp. Upon this, in a letter to his "beloved sons," the Roman people, the Pope exhaled all his wrath against the Tribune.¹ He was denounced under all those terrific appellations, perpetually thundered out by the Popes against their enemies. He was "a Belshazzar, the wild ass in Job, a Lucifer, a forerunner of Antichrist, a man of sin, a son of perdition, a son of the Devil, full of fraud and falsehood, and like the Beast in the Revelations, over whose head was written 'Blasphemy.'" He had insulted the Holy Catholic Church by declaring that the Church and State of Rome were one, and fallen into other errors against the Catholic faith, and incurred the suspicion of heresy and schism.

After his triumph over the Colonnas, Rienzi's pride had become even more offensive, and his magnificence still more insulted the poverty and necessities of the people. He was obliged to impose taxes; the gabelle

¹ This letter was printed by Pelzel; it is not in Papencordt.

on salt was raised. He had neglected to pursue his advantage against the Nobles: they still held many of the strongholds in the neighborhood, and cut off the supplies of corn and other provisions from the city. The few Barons of his party were rapidly estranged; the people were no longer under the magic of his spell; his hall of audience was vacant; the allied cities began to waver in their fidelity. Rienzi began too late to assume moderation. He endeavored again to associate the Pope's Vicar, the Bishop of Orvieto, in his rule. He softened his splendid appellations, and retained only the modest title, the "August Tribune!" He fell to "Knight and Stadtholder of the Pope." Amid an assembly of clergy and of the people, after the solemn chanting of psalms, and the hymn, "Thine, O Lord, is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory," he suspended before the altar of the Virgin his silver crown, his iron sceptre and orb of justice, with the rest of the insignia of his Tribunate.

All was in vain. Pepin, Palatine of Altamura and Count of Minorbino, marched into the city, and occupied one of the palaces of the Colonnas with an armed force. The bell of the Capitol rang unheeded to summon the adherents of Rienzi. He felt that his hour was come. He might, he avers, easily have resisted the sedition excited by Count Pepin, but he was determined to shed no more blood. He called an assembly of the Romans, solemnly abdicated his power, and departed, notwithstanding, he says, the reluctance and lamentations of the people. After his secession, it may well be believed that, under the reinstated tyranny of the Nobles, his government was remembered with regret; but when the robber chief,

Count Pepin
in Rome.

whom he had summoned before his tribunal, first entered Rome and fortified the Colonna Palace, Rienzi's tocsin had sounded in vain; the people flocked not to his banner, and now all was silence, desertion. Even with the handful of troops which he might have collected, a man of bravery and vigor might perhaps have suppressed the invasion; but all his energy was gone: he who had protested so often that he would lay down his life for the liberties of the people did not show the courage of a child.¹ His enemies could hardly believe their easy victory: for three days the Nobles without the city did not venture to approach the walls; Rienzi remained undisturbed within the Castle of St. Angelo. He made one effort to work on the people by his old arts. He had an angel painted on the walls of the Magdalen Church, with the arms of Rome, and a cross surmounted with a dove, and (in allusion, no doubt, to the well-known passage in the Psalms) trampling on an asp, a basilisk, a lion, and a dragon. Mischievous boys smeared the picture with mud. Rienzi, ^{Flight of} ^{Rienzi.} in the disguise of a monk, saw it in this state, Dec. 14 or 15. ordered a lamp to be kept burning before it for a year (as if to intimate his triumphant return in that time), and then fled from Rome.

His retreat was in the wild Apennines which border on the kingdom of Naples. There the austere- ^{Rienzi among} ^{the Fraticelli.} est of the austere Franciscans dwelt in their solitary cells in the deep ravines and on the mountain sides, the Spiritualists who adored the memory of Cœlestine V.,² despised the worldly lives of their less re-

¹ So writes the old Roman biographer.

² Rienzi at one time declared that Boniface VIII. appeared to him in a vision. All that in any way might tend to the glory of Rome found welcome in his mind.

cluse brethren, and brooded over the unfulfilled prophecies of the Abbot Joachim, John Peter Oliva, the Briton Merlin, all which foreshadowed the coming kingdom, the final revelation of the Holy Ghost. The proud vain Tribune exchanged his pomp and luxury for the habit of a tertiary of the Order (his marriage prohibited any higher rank); he wore the single coarse gown and cord; his life was a perpetual fast, broken only by the hard fare of a mendicant. He was enraptured with this holy society, in which were barons, Nobles, even some of the hostile house of Colonna. "O life which anticipates immortality! O angels' life, which the fiends of Satan alone could disturb! and yet these poor in spirit are persecuted by the Pope and the Inquisition!"

For two years and a half Rienzi couched unknown, as he asserts, among this holy brotherhood. 1348, 1349. The Plague. They were dismal, disastrous years. Earthquakes shook the cities of Christendom; Pope Clement, in terror of the plague which desolated Europe, shut himself up in his palace at Avignon, and burned large fires to keep out the terrible enemy. The enemy respected the Pope, but his subjects around perished in awful numbers. It is said that three fourths of the population in Avignon died: in Narbonne, thirty thousand; of twelve Consuls of Montpellier, ten fell victims. It was called the Black Plague; it struck grown-up men and women rather than youths. After it had abated, the women seemed to become wonderfully prolific, so as to produce a new race of mankind. As usual, causes beyond the ordinary ones were sought and found. The wells had been poisoned, of course by unbelievers. The Jews were everywhere massa-

cred. Pope Clement displayed a better title to the Divine protection than his precautions of seclusion and his fires. He used his utmost power to arrest the popular fury against these unhappy victims.¹ The Flagellants swarmed again through all the cities, scourging their naked bodies, and tracing their way by their gore. Better that fanaticism, however wild, should attempt to propitiate God by its own blood, rather than by that of others ; by self-torture rather than murder !²

The wild access of religious terror and prostration gave place, when the year of Jubilee began, *The Jubilee.* to as wild a tumult of religious exultation. Rome again swarmed with thousands on thousands of worshippers. Rienzi had meditated, but shrank in fear from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. It is said that he stole into Rome in disguise : the Tribune was lost in the multitude of adoring strangers.

Suddenly after his return, in his retreat on Monte Magello, he was accosted by the hermit, *Fra Fra Angelo.* Angelo, a man acknowledged by all the brethren as a prophet. Angelo pronounced his name, which he believed had been a profound secret. The prophet had been led to Rienzi's dwelling by Divine revelation : — "Rienzi had labored enough for himself ; he must now labor for the good of mankind. The universal reformation, foreseen by holy men, at the urgent prayer of the Virgin, was at hand : God had sent earthquakes

¹ This plague has a singular relation with the history of letters. Among its victims was Petrarch's Laura. It has been usually called the Plague of Florence, because described in the Decameron of Boccaccio ; just as the common pestilence of Europe is said to be that of Athens, because related by Thucydides. Singular privilege of genius, to concentrate all the interest and terror of such a wide-wasting calamity on one spot !

² See Continuator of Nangis ; and the very curious account, especially of the Flagellants, in Albertus Argentinensis, p. 150.

and great mortality on earth to chastise the sins of men. Such had been his predeterminate will before the coming of the blessed Francis. The prayers of St. Francis and St. Dominic, who had preached in the spirit of Enoch and Elias, had averted the doom." But "since there is now not one that doeth good, and the very Elect (the Dominicans and Franciscans) have cast off their primitive virtues, God has prepared, is preparing, vengeance. After this the Church will resume her primal holiness. There will be peace not only among Christians, but among Christians and Saracens. The age of the Holy Ghost is at hand. For this end a holy man, chosen of God, is to be made known to mankind by Divine revelation, who, with the Elect Emperor, shall reform the world, and strip the pastors of the Church of all temporal and fleeting superfluities."

Rienzi, from doubt, fear, perhaps some lingering touch, as he says, of his old arrogance, hesitated to undertake the mission to the Emperor Charles IV. imposed upon him by the prophet. Fra Angelo unfolded, with much greater distinctness, the secrets of futurity: he showed him prophecies of Spiritual men — of Joachim, of Oliva, of Merlin — already fulfilled. Rienzi deemed that it would be contumacy to God to resist the words of the prophet.¹

In the month of August appeared in the city of Prague a man in a strange dress. He stopped at the house of a Florentine apothecary, and asked to be presented to my Lord Charles the Emperor Elect: he had something to communicate to his honor and advantage.

Aug. 1,
possibly
in July.
Rienzi in
Prague.

¹ All this is from Rienzi's own letters in Papencordt, with the *Urkunde*.

Rienzi, admitted to the presence of the King of the Romans, announced his mission from the prophet, Fra Angelo. He had been commanded to deliver this message: — “Know ye, Sire and Emperor, that Brother Angelo has sent me to say to you, that up to this time the Father has reigned in this world, and God his Son. The power has now passed from him, and is given to the Holy Ghost, who shall reign for the time to come.” The Emperor, hearing that he thus separated and set apart the Father and Son from the Holy Ghost, said, “Art thou the man that I suppose you to be?”¹ He answered, “Whom do ye suppose me to be?” The Emperor said, “I suppose that you are the Tribune of Rome.” This the Emperor conjectured, having heard of the heresies of the Tribune, and he answered, “Of a truth I am he that was Tribune, and have been driven from Rome.” The Emperor sat in mute astonishment, while Rienzi exhorted him to the peaceful and bloodless conquest of Italy: — “In this great work none could be of so much service as himself. He alone could overcome the rival Orsinis and Colonnas.” He offered his son as a hostage: “he was prepared to sacrifice his Isaac, his only begotten, for the welfare of the people.” He demanded only the Imperial sanction. “Every one who presumes to take the rule in Rome when the Empire is not vacant, without leave of the Emperor, is an adulterer.”

He was admitted to a second interview. The Archbishop of Trèves, two other Bishops, the am-
bassadors of the King of Scotland, many

Second interview.

¹ I have moulded together the account in the historian Polistore, with Rienzi's own as it appears in the Urkunde. There is no essential discrepancy.

other nobles and doctors, sat around King Charles. Rienzi was commanded to repeat his message. He spoke on some points more at length:—"Another messenger had been sent to the Pope at Avignon: him the Pope would burn. The people of Avignon would rise and slay the Pope; then would be chosen an Italian Pope, a poor Pope, who would restore the Papacy to Rome. He would crown the Emperor with the crown of gold, King of Sicily, Calabria, Apulia; himself, Rienzi, King of Rome, and of all Italy. The Pope would build a temple in Rome to the Holy Ghost, more splendid than that of Solomon. Men would come out of Egypt and the East to worship there. The triune reign, the peaceful reign, of the Emperor, of Rienzi, and of the Pope, would be an earthly image of that of the Trinity."

The Archbishops and Bishops departed in amazement and horror. Rienzi was committed, as Rienzi in custody. having uttered language bordering at least upon heresy, to safe custody under the care of the Archbishop of Prague. He was commanded to put his words in writing. From his prison he wrote a long and elaborate address. He now revealed the secret of his own Imperial birth; he protested that he was actuated by no fantastic or delusive impulse; he was compelled by God to approach the Imperial presence; he had no ambition; he scorned (would that he had ever done so!) the vain glory of the world; he despised riches; he had no wish but in poverty to establish justice, to deliver the people from the spoilers and tyrants of Italy. "But arms I love, arms I seek and will seek; for without arms there is no justice." "Who knows," he proceeds, "whether God, of his divine providence,

did not intend me as the precursor of the Imperial authority, as the Baptist was of Christ?" For this reason (he intimates) he may have been regenerated in the font of Constantine, and this baptism may have been designed to wash away the stains which adhered to the Imperial power. He exhorts the Emperor to arise and gird on his sword, a sword which it became not the Supreme Pontiff to assume. He concludes by earnestly entreating his Imperial Majesty not rashly to repudiate his humble assistance; above all, not to delay his occupation of the city of Rome till his adversaries had got possession of the salt-tax and other profits of the Jubilee, which amounted to one hundred millions of florins, a sum strictly belonging to the Imperial treasury, and sufficient to defray the expenses of an expedition to Italy.

Charles of Bohemia was no Otho, no Frederick, no Henry of Luxemburg; his answer was by no means encouraging to the magnificent schemes <sup>Answer of
the Emperor.</sup> of the Tribune. It was a grave homily upon lowliness and charity. It repudiated altogether the design of overthrowing the Papal power, and protested against the doctrine of a new effusion of the Holy Ghost. As to the story of Rienzi's imperial descent, he leaves that to God, and reminds the Tribune that we are all the children of Adam, and all return to dust. Finally, he urges him to dismiss his fantastic views and earthly ambition; no longer to be stiff-necked and stony-hearted to God, but with a humble and contrite spirit to put on the helmet of salvation and the shield of faith.

Baffled in his attempts to work on the personal ambition of the Emperor, the pertinacious Rienzi had re-

course to his two most influential counsellors, John of Neumark, afterwards Chancellor, and Ernest of Parbubitz, Archbishop of Prague. John of Neumark professed a love of letters, and Rienzi addressed to him a brief epistle on which he lavished all his flowers of rhetoric. John of Neumark repaid him in the same coin. The Archbishop was a prelate of distinction and learning, disposed to high ecclesiastical views, well read in the canon law, and not likely to be favorable to the frantic predictions, or to the adventurous schemes of Rienzi. Yet to him Rienzi fearlessly addressed a long "libel," in which he repeated all his charges against the Pope of abandoning his spiritual duties, leaving his sheep to be devoured by wolves, and of dividing, rending, severing the Church, the very body of Christ, by scandals and schisms. The Pope violated every precept of Christian charity; Rienzi alone maintained no dreamy or insane doctrine, but the pure, true, sound apostolic and evangelic faith. It was the Pope who abandoned Italy to her tyrants, or rather armed those tyrants with his power. Rienzi contrasts his own peaceful, orderly, and just administration with the wild anarchy thus not merely unsuppressed, but encouraged by the Pope; he asserts his own more powerful protection of the Church, his enforcement of rigid morals. "And for these works of love the Pastor calls me a schismatic, a heretic, a diseased sheep, a blasphemer of the Church, a man of sacrilege, a deceiver, who deals with unclean spirits kept in the Cross of the Lord, an adulterator of the holy body of Christ, a rebel and a persecutor of the Church; but 'whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth:' as naked I entered into power,

so naked I went out of power, the people resisting and lamenting my departure.”¹

He reiterates his splendid offer to the Emperor for the subjugation of Italy. “If on the day of the Elevation of the Holy Cross I ascend up into Italy, unimpeded by the Emperor or by you, before Whitsuntide next ensuing I will surrender all Italy in peaceable allegiance to the Emperor.” For the accomplishment of this he offered hostages, whose hands were to be cut off if his scheme was not fulfilled in the prescribed time; and if he failed, he promised and vowed to return to prison to be dealt with as the Emperor might decide. He repeats that his mission, announced by the prophetic hermit, is to prepare the way for the peaceful entrance of the Emperor, to bind the tyrants in chains, and the nobles in links of iron. “So that Cæsar, advancing without bloodshed, not with the din of arms and *German fury*, but with psalteries and sweet-sounding cymbals, may arrive at the Feast of the Holy Ghost, and occupy his Jerusalem, a more peaceful and securer Solomon. For I wish this Cæsar, not secretly or as an adulterer, like his ancestor of old,² to enter the chamber of my mother, the city of Rome, but gladly and publicly, like a bridegroom, not to be introduced into my mother’s chamber by a single attendant, in dis-

¹ A little further on he gives this piece of history: “We read in the Chronicles that Julius, the first Cæsar, angry at the loss of some battle, was so mad as to raise his sword against his own life; but Octavianus, his grandson, the first Augustus, violently wrested the sword from his hand, and saved Cæsar from his own frantic hand. Cæsar, returning to his senses, immediately adopted Octavianus as his son, whom the Roman people afterwards appointed his successor in the empire. Thus, when I have wrested the frantic sword from his hand, the Supreme Pontiff will call me his faithful son.”

² Henry of Luxemburg. What does this strange confusion of allusion mean?

guise and through guarded barriers ; not as through the ancestor of Stephen Colonna, by whom he was betrayed and abandoned, but by the whole exulting people. Finally, that the bridegroom shall not find his bride and my mother an humble hostess and handmaid, but a free woman and a queen ; and the home of my mother shall not be a tavern but a church.”¹

The reply of the Archbishop was short and dry. He could not but wonder at his correspondent's protestations of humility, so little in accordance with the magnificent titles which he had assumed as Tribune ; or with his assertion that he was under the special guidance of the Holy Ghost. “ By what authority did Rienzi assert for the Roman people the right of electing the Emperor ? ” He was amazed that Rienzi, instead of the authentic prophecies of the Holy Scriptures, should consult the wild and unauthorized prophets Methodius and Cyril. The Archbishop ends with the words of Gamaliel, that “ if the Tribune's schemes are of God they will succeed, however men may oppose them.”

Was, then, Rienzi in earnest in his belief in all these mad apocalyptic visions ? Was he an honest fanatic ? Does his own claim, during all his early career, to the special favor of the Holy Ghost intimate an earlier connection, or only a casual sympathy and accordance with the Franciscan Spiritualists ? A letter to Fra Angelo is that of a passionate believer, prepared, he asserts, to lay down his imperilled life, entreating the prayers of the brethren, warning them that they may be exposed to persecution.² Or was it that in the obstinacy of

¹ There are several more letters to the Archbishop in the same rhapsodical tone and spirit.

² There is a strange passage about his wife (his Luna), which might tend

his hopes, the fertility of his resources, the versatility of his ambition, Rienzi deliberately threw himself on this wild religious enthusiasm and on Ghibellinism, to achieve that which he had failed to accomplish in his nobler way? Would he desperately, rather than abandon the liberty, the supremacy of Rome, enlist in his aid German and Imperial interests, Imperial ambition? The third and last act of his tragic life, which must await the Pontificate of Innocent VI., may almost warrant this view, if, in truth, the motives of men, especially of such men as Rienzi, are not usually mingled, clashing, seemingly irreconcilable impulses from contradictory and successive passions, opinions, and aims.

During all Rienzi's residence at Prague, the Pope had been in constant communication with the Emperor, and demanded the surrender of this son of Belial, to be dealt with as a suspected heretic and a rebel against the Holy See. The Emperor at length complied with his request. Rienzi's entrance into Prague has been described in the words of an old historian; his entrance into Avignon is thus portrayed by Petrarch. The poet's whole letter is a singular mixture of his old admiration, and even affection for Rienzi, with bitter disappointment at the failure of his splendid poetic hopes, and not without some wounded vanity and more timidity at having associated his own name with one, who, however formerly glorious, had sunk to a condition so contemptible. One of Rienzi's first acts on his arrival at Avignon was to inquire if his old friend and admirer

to the suspicion that she had been corrupted by some of his enemies among the Roman clergy. Yet both his wife and his daughters he hopes at the end will become Sisters of St. Clare (the female Franciscans). There are some tender parental provisions about his son, whom he consigns to the care of the Spiritual brethren. — Apud Papencordt, p. 74.

was in the city. "Perhaps," writes Petrarch, "he supposed that I could be of service to him; he knew not how totally this was out of my power; perhaps it was only a feeling of our former friendship." "There came lately to this court—I should not say came, but was brought as a prisoner—Nicolas Laurentius, the once formidable Tribune of Rome, who, when he might have died in the Capitol with so much glory, endured imprisonment, first by a Bohemian (the Emperor), afterwards by a Limousin (Pope Clement), so as to make himself, as well as the name and Republic of Rome, a laughing-stock. It is perhaps more generally known than I should wish, how much my pen was employed in lauding and exhorting this man. I loved his virtue, I praised his design; I congratulated Italy: I looked forward to the dominion of the beloved city and the peace of the world. . . . Some of my epistles are extant, of which I am not altogether ashamed, for I had no gift of prophecy, and I would that he had not pretended to the gift of prophecy; but at the time I wrote, that which he was doing and appeared about to do was not only worthy of my praise, but that of all mankind. Are these letters, then, to be cancelled for one thing alone, because he chose to live basely rather than die with honor? But there is no use in discussing impossibilities; I could not destroy them if I would; they are published, they are no longer in my power. But to my story. Humble and despicable that man entered the court, who, throughout the world, had made the wicked tremble, and filled the good with joyful hope and expectation; he who was attended, it is said, by the whole Roman people and the chief men of the cities of Italy, now appeared between two guards,

and with all the populace crowding and eager to see the face of him of whose name they had heard so much."

A commission of three ecclesiastics was appointed to examine what punishment should be inflicted on Rienzi. That he deserved the utmost punishment Petrarch declares, "not for his heresy, but for having abandoned his enterprise when he had conducted it with so much success; for having betrayed the cause of liberty by not crushing the enemies of liberty." Yet, after all, everything in this extraordinary man's life seems destined to be strange and unexpected. Rienzi could scarcely look for any sentence but death, death at the stake, as an audacious heretic, or perpetual imprisonment. He was at first closely and ignominiously guarded in a dungeon. He had few friends, many enemies at Avignon. He was even denied the aid of an advocate. Yet the trial by the three Cardinals was not pursued with activity. Perhaps Clement's approaching death inclined him to indifference, if not to mercy; then his decease and the election 1352.

of a new Pope distracted public attention. The charge of heresy seems to have quietly dropped. Petrarch began to dare to feel interest in his fate; he even ventured to write to Rome to urge the intercession of the people in his behalf. Rome was silent; but Avignon seemed suddenly moved in his favor. Rumor spread abroad that Rienzi was a great poet; and the whole Papal court, the whole city, at this first dawn of letters, seemed to hold a poet as a sacred, almost supernatural being. "It would be a sin to put to death a man skilled in that wonderful art." Rienzi was condemned to imprisonment; but imprisonment neither

too ignominious nor painful. A chain, indeed, around his leg was riveted to the wall of his dungeon. But his meals were from the remnants of the Pope's table distributed to the poor. He had his Bible and his Livy, perhaps yet unexhausted visions of future distinction, which strangely enough came to pass.

CHAPTER XI.

INNOCENT VI.

THE terrible Black Plague had startled the voluptuous Court of Avignon to seriousness. The last act of Clement VI. was one of papal wisdom and of earnest religion. He had not set the example of Christian courage and devotion to the distresses of the more than decimated people (two thirds, it was said, of the population in Languedoc and Provence had perished¹), but he dared to admire that virtue in others which he displayed not in himself. The clergy too had mostly stood aloof during these dreary times in terror and in apathy. The Mendicant Friars alone were everywhere, braving contagion by the sick-bed, in the church, in the church-yard; praying with the people, praying for the people, praying over their bodies, which owed to them alone decent interment. The grateful people repaid them with all they could bestow.

¹ Petrarch writes of it (it swept away his Laura) —

“ *Exemplis caritura quidem, tenuemque nepotum
Vix habitura fidem : superant si forte nepotes,
Nec finem modo fata parant imponere mundo.*”
Ecloga ix.

The “ *Epistola ad seipsum* ” is at once more true and throughout more poetical : —

“ *Funera crebra quidem, quocunque parentia flecto
Lumina, conturbant aciem : perplexa feretris
Templa gemunt, passimque simul sine honore cadaver
Nobile plebelumque jacet.*”

Alms, oblations, bequests, funeral dues, poured upon them, and upon them alone. The clergy took alarm; they found themselves everywhere supplanted in the affections of men, in their wills, in the offerings at the altar. The very dead seemed to reject them, and, as it were, to seek the church-yards of the Friars for their holy rest. They began to clamor, even more loudly than heretofore, against these invasions of their rights. The cardinals, many bishops, a multitude of the secular clergy, thronged to Avignon; they demanded the suppression of the Mendicants. By what authority did they preach, hear confessions, intercept the alms of the faithful, even the burial dues of their flocks?

Consistory of
Avignon.

The Consistory sat, not one was present who dared to lift his voice in favor of the Friars. The Pope rose: the Pope might well know of what incalculable importance were the Mendicants to his own power, but he might also at this time have had more generous, more pious motives. He defended them with imposing eloquence against their adversaries. At the close of his speech he turned to the prelates: "And if the Friars were not to preach to the people, what would ye preach? Humility? you, the proudest, the most disdainful, the most magnificent among all the estates of men, who ride abroad in procession on your stately palfreys! Poverty? ye who are so greedy, so obstinate in the pursuit of gain, that all the prebends and benefices of the world will not satiate your avidity! Chastity? of this I say nothing! God knows your lives, how your bodies are pampered with pleasures. If you hate the Begging Friars, and close your doors against them, it is that they may not see your lives; you had rather waste your wealth on panders and ruf-

fians than on Mendicants. Be not surprised that the Friars receive bequests made in the time of the fatal mortality, they who took the charge of parishes deserted by their pastors, out of which they drew converts to their houses of prayer, houses of prayer and of honor to the Church, not seats of voluptuousness and luxury." So went forth to the world the debate in the Consistory at Avignon.¹

Yet Clement VI., not long before his death,² had filled up the conclave with French prelates; twelve were appointed at once in the interests of the King of France. The King of England, now, by the victory at Crecy and by conquest, master of great part of France, had in vain demanded one place.³ The re-

¹ Continuator of Nangis, sub ann.

² There are two terrible satires by Petrarch against Clement VI. The first an Eclogue (the sixth) between Pamphilus (St. Peter) and Micio (Pope Clement). Pamphilus, whom Micio in his unblushing effrontery insults by openly avowing his love of gold and pleasure, and by comparing himself with St. Peter, breaks out in these lines:

"*Es meritis post vincula crucem, post verbera ferrum,
Supplicium breve! quin potius sine fine dolores
Carceris æterni, vel si quid tristius usquam est.
Serve infide, fugax, Dominoque ipgrate benigno.*"

The second (Eclogue VII.) is between Micio (Pope Clement) and Epi or Epicureanism, who in the warmest language declare their mutual, inseparable attachment.

³ Vit. apud Baluz. The seventh Eclogue of Petrarch also contains the most bitter descriptions of the Cardinals who formed the Conclave on the death of Clement. De Sade (iii, pp. 149 and 276) boasted that he could furnish the key to the whole satire, and show the original of every one of the portraits drawn in such sharp and hateful lineaments, but he abstained, not perhaps without some recollection that they were French Cardinals. It dwells chiefly, in no modest terms, on their voluptuousness. Of one he says:

"*Tamen omnia turbat
Septa furens, nullasque sinit dormire quietas
Somnifera sub nocte capras.*"

Of another:

"*Liquitur hic luxu.*"

mains of the deceased Pope were attended to their final resting-place at Chaise Dieu in Auvergne, by five cardinals, one his brother, three his nephews, one his Conclave. kinsman. The Conclave looked at first to John Borelli, General of the Carthusian Order, a man of profound learning and piety. The Cardinal Talleyrand Perigord warned them, that under his austere rule their noble horses would in a few days be reduced to draw wagons or to toil before the plough. They passed a law by unanimous consent which would have raised the College of Cardinals to a dominant, self-elected aristocracy, superior to the Pope. The Pope could create no Cardinal till the number was reduced to sixteen, nor increase the number beyond twenty. Nor could he nominate these Cardinals without the consent of the whole, or at least two thirds of the Conclave. Without their consent he could neither depose nor put under arrest any Cardinal, nor seize or confiscate their property. The Cardinals were to enjoy, according to the statute of Nicolas IV., one half of all the revenues of the Papal See.¹ All swore to observe this statute; some with the reservation if it was according to law.

The election fell on Stephen Aubert, a Limousin, a distinguished Canon lawyer, Bishop of Clermont. The first act of Innocent VI. was to release himself from his oath, to rescind, and declare null and illegal, this statute of the Conclave. He proceeded to redress some of the abuses under the rule of his predecessor. He was more severe and discriminating in his preferments; he compelled residence: he drove away a great part of the multitude of bishops and beneficed clergy who passed their time at Avignon

Innocent VI.
Dec. 18, 1352.

¹ Raynaldus, A. D. 1352, c. xxix.

in luxury and in the splendor of the papal court. One instance was recorded of his conduct. A favorite chaplain presented his nephew, quite a youth, for preferment. "One of the seven benefices which you hold," said the Pope, "will suit him well." The chaplain looked grave and melancholy. The Pope compelled him to choose the three best of his remaining benefices: "with the other three I shall be able to reward three of the poor and deserving clergy."¹ But for the nepotism, which seemed the inalienable infirmity of the whole succession, Innocent VI. had escaped that obloquy, which is so loud against almost all the Avignonese pontiffs. The times were favorable to his peaceful and dignified rule: his reign of nearly ten years was uneventful, or rather the great events disturbed not the temporal or religious tranquillity of the Pope. John, King of France, a prisoner after the battle of Poitiers, was too weak to exercise any de-^{France and England.}grading tyranny over the Pope; and though French at heart, by birth and by interest, Innocent was too prudent to attempt to enforce his offers of mediation by ecclesiastical censures against Edward or his son the Black Prince. Once indeed the course of victory brought the younger Edward to the foot of the bridge of Avignon (the Pope had taken the precaution of encircling the city with strong fortifications). The border districts of Aquitaine, which the King of France was required to surrender, would have included many of the southern bishoprics in the English province. England would have been in dangerous approximation to Avignon.² Bands of English adventurers burned

¹ Vit. iii. apud Baluz.

² During the pontificate of Innocent VI. there is scarcely an historical

St. Esprit and Mondragon ; and were only bought off by a large sum of money.¹

Charles IV. was undisputed Emperor ; his prudence or his want of ambition kept him in dutiful submission to the Pope.² He determined to observe nearly to the letter the humiliating agreement, by which he was to enter Rome only to be crowned, and to leave it the instant that ceremony was over. He descended into Italy with a small squadron of horse. Notwithstanding the urgent entreaties and tempting offers of the Ghibelline chieftains ; notwithstanding a vigorous and eloquent remonstrance of Petrarch, whose poetic imagination would have raised him into a deliverer, a champion of the unity of Italy, as Dante Henry of Luxemburg ; Charles pursued his inglorious course, and quietly retired beyond the Alps, virtually abandoning all the imperial rights in Italy.

Charles IV., despised by many for his ignominious subservience to the Pope, and his total withdrawal from

document in the Papal correspondence ; it consists almost wholly of dispensations for holding pluralities, decisions on convent property, dispensations for marriage. V. xxiv. p. 336: Is a letter to the Prince of Wales ; his men had taken Robert de Veyrac, canon of Bourges, and plundered him. May 4, 1366: Safe-conduct is requested for his Legates, sent to entreat peace. P. 352: Is a curious letter to the Bishop of London: "The tongue offends trebly by a lie, God, our neighbor, and ourselves." The Pope was accused as though "non mediatoris partes assumpsimus sed turbationis egimus." The Bishop of London had not contradicted these wicked rumors. — Villeneuve, June 18, 1356. See following letters.

¹ The Pope (June 24, 1356) writes to his *Vicar* in the March of Ancona about *English* troops (*condottieri*?) making irruptions into the territory of St. Peter. English cruisers had seized a Neapolitan and Genoese vessel with Papal effects on board. There is a letter (Oct. 1356) praising the noble conduct of the Black Prince to his prisoner, King John. See also other singularly *meek* letters to the Black Prince. — March, 1362.

² Ockham described Charles IV. as "*mancipium Avinonensium sacrificulorum a quibus imperium emerat.*" — Quoted in Wolfi *Lectiones*, p. 496.

Italian politics, nevertheless, by one sagacious or fortunate measure, terminated the long strife between the Papacy and the Empire. The famous Golden Bull seemed only to fix the constitutional rights of the electors. It declared the electoral dignity to be attached forever to certain hereditary and indivisible fiefs. Before this time the severance of those fiefs had split up the right among many competitors. It thus raised the electoral office to a peculiar and transcendent height. It gave to the Seven, the four lay fiefs, Bohemia, Saxony, Brandenburg, the Palatinate, and the three great archbishoprics, the full, absolute, unlimited power of election. It did not deny, but it did not acknowledge, any right of interposition in the Pope, either to control the election or to refuse his confirmation. Germany had the sole, unquestioned privilege of electing the King of the Romans (that appellation sunk into a mere title of honor); the King of the Romans became Emperor, but Emperor of Germany. On Italy, the great cause of contention between Popes and Em-
A.D. 1355.
perors, the Golden Bull was silent. Innocent, whether he had the wisdom to discern the ultimate bearings of this great act, raised no protest. His acquiescence was tacit, but still it was acquiescence.

Innocent VI., by the prudent or happy choice of his legate, the martial Cardinal Ægidio Albornoz, Archbishop of Toledo, restored the papal influence, which had been almost lost, at least in Southern Italy. When Albornoz took the field, all Romagna was in
The Cardinal Albornoz.
the hands of the old Roman barons or fierce
and lawless military adventurers. The papal banner hung only on the walls of two castles, Montefiascone and Montefalcone. Petty tyrants of either class had

seized the cities ; Giovanni del Vico, nominally Prefect
A.D. 1353. of Rome, occupied on his own account the
 greater part of the patrimony of St. Peter, even
 Viterbo. In a prison at Avignon Alborno found
 perhaps his most useful ally, no less than the Tribune
 Rienzi.

Who could have supposed that this man, hardly
Rienzi. escaped from death as a dangerous usurper of
 the papal authority, and who had endeavored to incite
 the Emperor to reduce the papal power within the
 strict limits of papal jurisdiction, that the writer of
 those stern and uncompromising invectives against the
 desertion of Italy by the Popes, the unsparing castigat-
 or of the vices of the clergy, the heaven-appointed re-
 former (as he asserted) of the Church, the harbinger
 of the new kingdom of the Holy Ghost ; that he should
 emerge from his dungeon, to reappear in Italy as the
 follower of the papal Legate, and reassume the supreme
 government in Rome with the express sanction of the
 Pope. Such, however, were the unparalleled vicissi-
 tudes in the life of Rienzi. Since the fall of the Trib-
 une Rome had returned to her miserable anarchy.
 For a time two Senators chosen out of the nobles, for

Rome.
 Baroncelli.

another period a popular leader named Cer-
 rone, held the government. A second Trib-
 une had arisen, Baroncelli, who attempted to found a
 new republic on the model of that of Florence ; but the
 fall of Baroncelli had been almost as rapid as his rise.
 Plague and earthquake had visited the city ; and though
 the Jubilee had drawn thousands of pilgrims from all
 parts of the world, and poured wealth into her bosom,
 this wealth had been but a new object of strife, faction,
 and violence.

Rienzi had been released from prison. The Papal court began to think that under the judicious guidance of Albornoz, Rienzi's advice and knowledge of Italy and Rome might be of use to the Papal cause. The Vice-Legate in Rome, too, Hugo Harpagon, represented that his sufferings had no doubt taught Rienzi wisdom, that he had abandoned his old fantastic dreams of innovation; his name was still popular in Rome, he might be employed to counteract the dominant impiety and evil. The more immediate object appears to have been to use him as an opponent to Baroncelli, who had usurped the office and title of Tribune. Harpagon requested that he might be sent to Rome.

Rienzi, weary of his long incarceration and long inactivity, embraced the offer without reluctance. So was he now to share in that work, which he had said in one of his addresses to Charles IV., would be much more easy, more safe, and more congenial to his disposition; to reduce distracted Italy to unity and peace in the name of the Holy Mother the Church, rather than in the interests of the Empire.¹ Ere his arrival, Baroncelli had already fallen. Albornoz, who perhaps had formed a sounder estimate of Rienzi's character, retained him in his own camp. There Rienzi cast the spell of his eloquence over two distinguished youths, Arimbald, a lawyer, and Brettone, a knight, brothers of the celebrated and formidable Fra Moreale, the captain of the great Free Company.

On Moreale in some degree depended the fate of Romagna and of Rome. Out of the books of his youthful studies, the companions of his

Rienzi again
in Italy.

Rienzi
Senator.

¹ See Papencordt, p. 232.

dismal prison, Livy and the Bible, the Tribune filled his young partisans with his lofty notions of the greatness of Rome, and infatuated them by splendid promises of advancement. They lent him considerable sums of money, and enabled him to borrow more. He appeared, accompanied by these youths, and in a gorgeous dress,¹ before the Legate, and demanded to be invested in the dignity of Senator of Rome. The Papal authority was yet acknowledged in Rome by the factious Nobles. It seemed a favorable opportunity, and worth the hazard. In the name of the Church Albornož appointed Rienzi Senator of Rome. With a few troops the Senator advanced, and in a short time was once more master of the scene of his former power and glory.

But Rienzi had not learnt wisdom. He was again His rule. bewildered by the intoxication of power; he returned to his old pomp and his fatal luxury. He extorted the restoration of his confiscated property, and wasted it in idle expenditure. He was constantly encircled by his armed guard; he passed his time in noisy drunken banquets. His person became gross, hateful, and repulsive.² Again called on to show his military

¹ The Roman biographer, who seems to have been an eye-witness, describes his splendid attire with minute particularity.

² The Roman biographer is again our authority. "Formerly he was sober, temperate, abstemious; he had now become an inordinate drunkard . . . he was always eating confectionery and drinking. It was a terrible thing to be forced to see him (*horribile cosa era potere patire di vederlo*). They said that in person he was of old quite meagre, he had become enormously fat (*grasso sterminatamente*); he had a belly like a tun; jovial, like an Asiatic Abbot (*habea una ventresca tonna, joviale, a modo de uno Abbate Asiano*). (Another MS. reads *Abbate Asinino*.) He was full of shining flesh (*carbuncles?*), like a peacock — red, and with a long beard; his face was always changing; his eyes would suddenly kindle like fire; his understanding, too, kindled in fitful flashes like fire (*così se mutava suo intelletto com e fuoco*)."— *Apud Muratori, Ant. Ital. xii. p. 524.*

proress against the refractory Colonnas, he was again found wanting. The stern and equal vigor which had before given a commanding majesty to his wild justice, now seemed to turn to caprice and wantonness of power. His great measure by which he appeared determined, this time at least, to escape the imputation of pusillanimity as shrinking from the extermination of his enemies, was sullied with ingratitude, as well as treachery. The execution of Fra Moreale, the brother of the youths to whom he had been so deeply indebted (Moreale he had perfidiously seized), revolted rather than awed the public mind. The second government of Rienzi was an unmitigated tyranny, and ended in his murder in a popular insurrec-
Death of
Rienzi.
A.D. 1354.
tion. With the cry of "Long live the people" was now mingled "Death to the Tribune, to the traitor Rienzi." His body was treated with the most shameful indignities.

Cardinal Albornozy proceeded calmly, sternly, in his course. In a few years he had restored the Papal power in almost all the cities of Romagna, in Rome itself. Once he was rashly recalled; all fell back into its old confusion. On the return of Albornozy, who was equally formidable in the darkest intrigue
A.D. 1353
and the fiercest conflict of arms, the Papal authority resumed its predominance.

Just before his death, Innocent VI. received the grateful intelligence, that long-rebellious Rome had
Rome sub-
mits.
at last submitted to the dominion of a foreign Pope. The only condition was that the dreaded Cardinal Albornozy should not bear sway within the city.

The magnificent tomb of Innocent VI. in Ville-

neuve, the city on the right bank of the Rhone, remains to bear witness to the wealth and splendor of the most powerful and most prudent of the Avignonese Pontiffs; the fame of the most pious he must leave to his successor.

CHAPTER XII.

URBAN V.

ON the death of Innocent VI. twenty Cardinals met in Conclave. Mutual jealousies would not Oct. 28, 1362. permit them to elect one of their own order: yet it seemed so strange that they should go beyond that circle, that the election of Urban V. was attributed to direct inspiration from God.¹ The choice fell on William Grimoard, Abbot of St. Victor in Urban V. Marseilles, then on a mission in Italy, and yet unsuspected of Italian attachments. William heard the tidings of the death of Innocent at Florence. He exclaimed, that if a Pope were elected who should restore the seat of St. Peter to Italy, and crush the tyrants in Romagna, he should die content. Had this speech, bruited abroad in Italy, been heard in Avignon, William Grimoard had never ascended the Papal throne.

Urban V. (he took this name) excelled in the better qualities of a Benedictine monk. He en- Character. forced severe discipline upon the Conclave, the court, the clergy.² He discountenanced the pomp and lux-

¹ Petrarch boldly asserts that the election was supernatural; that such men as the Cardinals could only have been overruled by the Holy Spirit to suspend their own jealousies and ambition; that the object of the Holy Spirit was the elevation of a Pope who should return to Rome. — Compare Vit. i.

² See authorities in the four lives in Baluzius.

ury of the Cardinals, and would endure no factions. He introduced into the court the most rigid order, and impartial justice. He punished the abuses among the lawyers practising in these courts, and cut short their profitable delays. He set himself against concubinage in all orders, especially the clergy. He condemned usurers, and obliged certain of that craft to regorge 200,000 florins. He mulcted and expelled all who were guilty of simony from his court. He compelled those who had accumulated many benefices to surrender all which they could not serve in person. He was rigid in examining the attainments and morals of those whom he preferred. He was a munificent patron of learned men; maintained at his own expense one thousand scholars at different universities; he was constantly supplying them with books. At Montpellier, the great school of medicine, he founded and endowed a noble college. He was not charged with avarice, he imposed no unusual subsidies; he was liberal to the poor.¹ With the exception of his brother, whom he made Bishop of Avignon, and, at the request of the Conclave, Cardinal, and one nephew, a man of merit, he advanced none of his kindred. He kept his lay relatives in their proper sphere; a nephew married the daughter of a merchant at Marseilles. He established a kind of secret moral and religious inspection throughout Christendom, and invited to his court devout and discreet men of different nations. From them he obtained knowledge of the life and morals of the more notable men in all realms.

Pope Urban V. might stand aloof in dignified seclusion from temporal affairs, except in Italy. The King

¹ Vit. i. et iv.

of France was in too low a condition to enforce any unbecoming submission; the King of England ^{State of Europe.} too strong for the Pope even to resent the vigorous measures of the English Parliament in limitation of the Papal power. The Emperor Charles IV., after the Golden Bull, demeaned himself almost as a willing vassal of the Holy See. The old antagonists of the Popedom, the Viscontis, were almost alone in open hostility with the Pope. The head of that house ^{of Italy.} had united in himself the spiritual and civil supremacy in Italy.¹ John, Archbishop of Milan, ruled as Sovereign, headed his armies as General, invaded his neighbors as an independent potentate. The warlike Legate, Albornoz, fully occupied in the South, ^{The Viscontis.} respected the warlike Archbishop. The Archbishop found it politic to maintain peace with Albornoz. The death of the Archbishop left his territories to be divided between his three nephews. The elder, the voluptuous Matteo, soon died of debauchery, Oct. 5, 1354. or poisoned by his two brothers, Bernabo and Galeazzo, who dreaded the effect of those debaucheries in thwarting their loftier ambition. Bernabo sought to advance his power by intrigue and arms. Galeazzo had bought the daughter of the King of France, Isabella of Valois, as a bride for his son. He afterwards wedded his daughter to Lionel, Duke of Clarence, son of Edward III. Bernabo had been expelled from Bologna by the Cardinal Albornoz; he had besieged the city in vain: he was thus in open war with the Church. A.D. 1352. Almost the first act of Urban V. was to fulminate a Bull against Bernabo;² summoning him to appear at

¹ Sismondi, *Républiques Italiennes*, vi. c. 43.

² The Bull in Raynaldus.

Avignon in March to hear his sentence. The charges were sufficiently awful, debaucheries and cruelties, diabolic hatred of the Church. He had forced the Archbishop of Milan to kneel before him, and fiercely asked him whether he knew not that Bernabo Visconti was

*Crimes of
Bernabo.*

Pope, Emperor, and Sovereign in his own territories; that neither Emperor nor God could do anything against his will. He had cast the Archbishop into prison; he had published a prohibition to all his subjects, under pain of being burned, to seek any act of pardon from the Papal court, or from the Pope's Legate, to make them any payment, or to take counsel with them. He would admit no presentation of the Pope to bishopric or abbacy. He had contemptuously opened, publicly torn, and trampled on sundry writings and ordinances of the Holy See. This was not the worst; he had burned priests and monks in iron cages; beheaded or tortured others to death; bored the ears of a pious Franciscan with a red-hot iron; compelled a priest at Parma to mount a lofty tower and pronounce an anathema against Pope Innocent VI. and his Cardinals; he had seized with insatiable rapacity the goods of the Church.

Bernabo, as might be expected, appeared not in Avignon. The Pope declared him excommunicate, and all who aided and abetted him involved in his excommunication. He knelt and invoked Christ himself, the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the host of heaven, that this bloody and misbelieving tyrant might be punished in the world to come as in this world. He ordered a crusade to be preached throughout Italy against the Visconti.

But in Italy, even from an Italian Pope, these ter-

rific words had worn out all their magic ; from a foreign Pope hated by the Italians as an alien, despised as the vassal of France, even of fallen France, they were utterly disregarded. Bernabo, this monster of wickedness, found no difficulty in purchasing peace by abandoning his groundless claims on Bologna. Even Urban V. must close his eyes to the crimes of the Visconti.

The state of Italy was doubtless among the motives which induced Pope Urban to meditate the restoration of the Papal See to Rome. The reign of each successive Pope in Avignon had widened the estrangement of Italy and of Rome from the Papal interests. The successes of the Cardinal Albornoz were but the invasions and conquests of a foreign power. Both awe and attachment must eventually, if slowly, die out altogether. The Ghibellines had long lost all awe ; the Guelfs would become an anti-Ghibelline, no longer a Papal faction ; they would neither fight nor intrigue for a Pope who had ceased to be Italian. Rome would not endure much longer (she had but partially endured) her baffled hopes of becoming again the metropolis of Papal dignity and Papal wealth, the heart of the world, the centre of religious business, the holy place of religious pilgrimage, of the simultaneous reverence and oblations of Christendom to the shrines of the apostles, and shrines of their successors ; she would not, she could not, much longer be deluded by specious but insincere promises, with the courteous mockery of her urgent ineffective invitations. It might be dangerous to reside among the feuds of the turbulent nobles at Rome and in the Roman territory, or the no less turbulent people ; but the danger of alienating Italy altogether was still greater.

If a Transalpine Pontiff might thus insensibly lose all authority in Italy — if throughout Christendom the illusion of Apostolic Majesty, which invested the successor of St. Peter in what was believed to have been his actual throne at Rome, would gradually but inevitably have melted away, should he entirely desert that throne — besides this the position of the Pope at Avignon had become insecure. The King of France, a prisoner in England, had ceased to tyrannize, but he had also ceased to protect. The leaders of the English conquests had approached to a dangerous proximity. England openly resisted the Papal grant to France of the tenths to maintain the war.¹ The Black Prince could not be ignorant of the inclinations, the more than inclinations, the secret subsidies and aids, of the Pope to his enemies. Urban was a Frenchman: what Frenchman had not deeply commiserated the state of his native land? England (since the Papal power had reached its height within the realm, in the time after Becket and that of King John) had been gradually assuming the tone of ecclesiastical independence. The civil and spiritual liberties had grown up together: the Commons showed as great reluctance to submit to Papal as to Royal exactions. Under Edward III., the nation, proud of his victories, was entirely on the King's side. The subservient attachment of the Pope

¹ See the curious Eclogue of Petrarch (the twelfth), written after the battle of Poitiers. Pan is France, Faustula the Papacy, Articus England.

“ Tot deerant alimenta viris, nisi Pana virili
Faustula sollicitum curarum parte levasset,
Nam grege de magno *decimam* largissima quamque
Obtulit, atque famem sedavit pinguibus hædis.
Ah meretrix! (obliqua tuens ait Articus illi)
Immemorem sponsi, cupidus quem mungit adulter.
Hæc tibi sola fides? sic sic aliena ministras?”

to the King of France had no doubt considerable influence on the bold measures of the English Legislature. They had infinitely less reverence for a French Pope. All this will require further development.

Rumors began to spread of Urban's design to return to Italy. Perhaps his speech at Florence, before his election, had now transpired in Avignon. The Conclave, almost entirely French, heard with dismay the urgent and reiterated representations from Rome, to which the Pope lent too willing an ear. Petrarch, who in his youth had appealed to Benedict XII., in his manhood to Clement VI., now in his old age addressed a more grave and solemn expostulation to Urban V. The poet described, perhaps with some poetic license, the state of widowed Rome: — "While ye are sleeping on the shores of the Rhone, under a gilded roof, the Lateran is a ruin, the Mother of Churches open to the wind and rain; the churches of the Apostles are shapeless heaps of stones." The tremendous appeal which closed his prolix argument demanded of Urban, "whether, on the great day of judgment, he had rather rise again among the famous sinners of Avignon, than with Peter and Paul, Stephen and Lawrence, Silvester, Gregory, Jerome, Agnes, and Cecilia?"¹

The determination of the Pope was doubtless confirmed during a visit of the Emperor to Avignon. He resolved to break through ^{Pope determines on return to Italy.} the thralldom of the Conclave. He had himself never been a Cardinal, he belonged not to their factions. He had deprived their houses of the right of asylum: in those houses the most infamous in that infamous population had found refuge. By one account

¹ Petrarch, *Senilia*, lib. vii.

he created two new Cardinals, and contemptuously declared that he had as many Cardinals as he chose under the hood of his cowl.¹ The Cardinals heard the summons to accompany the Pope to Italy as a sentence of exile. They were strangely ignorant of Italy: supposed the climate, country, food, wretched and unwholesome.² They trembled for their lives in turbulent Rome; they would not quit their sumptuous and luxurious palaces. Five only, it is said, followed him to Marseilles. As they left the port they shrieked aloud as in torture, "Oh wicked Pope! Oh godless brother! whither is he dragging his sons?" as though they were to be transported to the dungeons of the Saracens in Ctesiphon or Memphis, not to the capital city of Christendom.³

The Pope set sail from Marseilles. The galleys of Joanna of Naples, of Venice, of Genoa, and of Pisa, crowded to escort the successor of St. Peter back to Italy. He landed at Genoa, was received in great state by the Doge and the Seignory. He celebrated Ascension Day in the cathedral church. He embarked and reached the shore near Corneto. He was received by Alborno, the Legate; silken tents were pitched upon the sands, amid arches of green foliage. He said Mass, mounted a horse, and rode into Corneto: there he stayed during the Feast of Pentecost. The ambassadors of the Roman people presented themselves to acknowledge his full sovereignty, and to offer the keys of St. Angelo. His arrival in Viterbo was saddened by the death of Alborno,⁴ a Prelate who,

Embarks
for Italy.
April 20,
1367.

May 4.

June 4.

Aug. 24.

¹ Vit. iii.

² Vit. ii.

³ Petrarch, Senilia, ix. 2, p. 857.

⁴ "In factis armorum, non omissâ pontificali decentiâ, valde doctus et expertus." — Vit. i. 379.

though highly skilled and expert in deeds of arms, never forgot his pontifical decency. A riot in Viterbo was suppressed; the ringleaders hanged by the people themselves.

After some delay he made his public entry into Rome. He was greeted by the clergy and ^{At Rome.} people with a tumult of joy. He celebrated Mass at the altar of St. Peter, the first Pope since the days of Boniface VIII. The Papal palace was in ruins; Urban commenced extensive repairs; but his chosen residence was not Rome, but Montefiascone, whose pleasant and quiet situation filled him with delight. While he lived in a noble palace built there, the affairs of his Court were conducted at Viterbo. The next year the Emperor, who in an assembly of his Estates at Vienna had proclaimed himself the loyal protector of the Pope, and confirmed him in the possession of all his territories, set out for Rome at the head of a powerful force. In Rome he led the Pope's horse from the ^{Aug. 1368.} Castle of St. Angelo to St. Peter's, and served ^{The Emperor} ^{at Rome.} him as a Deacon during the high service. The Empress received the crown from the Pope. The Emperor named an ecclesiastic, the Cardinal di Porto, his Vicar in Italy. To some this was a most magnificent, to others a contemptible spectacle. The clergy were in raptures of joy at the honors paid to the Pope; the Roman people were delighted at the unwonted amity between these old implacable antagonists, the Emperor and the Pope; but the cold Ghibellines either looked with scorn at the humiliation of the Emperor, or treated it as base hypocrisy. The enemies of the Church laughed at it as a theatric show. "I," says a devout eye-witness, "was drunk with delight, I could

not command myself, beholding a sight which my forefathers had never seen, and that we had never hoped to see — the Papacy and the Empire at unity, the flesh obedient to the spirit, the kingdom of the earth subject to the kingdom of heaven.”¹

But neither the pomps of Rome nor the pleasant seclusion of Montefiascone could retain a French Prelate, though that Prelate was Urban V. He had not firmness to resist the incessant murmurs, the urgent entreaties, of the Cardinals. From the vast buildings which were still going on at his cost at Avignon, he must have contemplated a return, if but for a time, to Sept. 5, 1370. that city. Only two years after the interview with the Emperor at Rome, Pope Urban embarked again near Corneto, after a prosperous voyage arrived at Marseilles, and reëstablished himself at Avignon. The excuse alleged in public was his parental desire to reconcile the Kings of France and England, but no one believed that he himself believed in this excuse. Dec. 19. He went there, however, only to die: two months had hardly passed when he expired. His weakness may have been a secret inward longing for his native land. Petrarch, notwithstanding this last act of infirmity, honored his memory, and wrote in fervent language of his virtues.²

¹ Coluccio Salutati (he was present), quoted by Pelzel.

² Petrarch, *Senil.* xiii. *Epist.* 13.

CHAPTER XIII.

GREGORY XI.

THE Conclave, in raising the nephew of Clement VI. to the Pontificate, might think themselves secure against any compulsory return to Italy. Peter Roger had become a Cardinal before he was eighteen years old. Among those dissolute youths whose promotion by Clement VI. gave offence, the young Cardinal Peter alone vindicated this flagrant act of nepotism by his severe theological studies, and by his mastery over the canon law. His morals were blameless; he was singularly apt, easy, and agreeable in the despatch of business, popular in the Conclave. He assumed the Popedom with sincere reluctance. Gregory XI. inherited the weakness of his uncle—immoderate love of his kindred, with whom he crowded all offices, ecclesiastical as well as civil. This was his one infirmity. Gregory XI. was in the prime of life, but he suffered under a painful disease.

The first years of Gregory's Pontificate were one long period of disasters. His offers of mediation between England and France were ^{State of Italy.} rejected with indifference approaching to contempt.¹

¹ MS., B. M. Instructions and powers to two Nuncios, the Cardinals St. Sisto and IV. Coronarum. There is a tone of serious and commanding

Italy, abandoned by the Popes, except to be tyrannized over and burdened with inordinate exactions by weak and venal Legates, unworthy successors of the able and vigorous Albornoz, seemed determined altogether to revolt from allegiance to the Pope. Bernabo Visconti aimed at absolute dominion; he laughed to scorn the excommunications repeated from time to time, if possible, with accumulated maledictions. One of these contained a prohibition against intermarriages with the females of that house — an invention of Papal presumption reserved for this late period, but an idle protest against the splendid and royal connections already formed by that aspiring family. The Free Dec. 17, 1372. Companies — that more especially of the Englishman, John Hawkwood, taking service with the highest bidder, or, if unhired, plundering and wasting under their own banner — inflicted impartial misery on Guelf and Ghibelline.¹

earnestness in the admonitions to peace: this continues, if possible with deepening solemnity, perhaps because so ineffective, during the whole seven years from the accession of Gregory, 1370, to the death of Edward III., 1377. There is a striking letter to the Black Prince (who must have received it when perhaps under his slow mortal illness, near his end), dwelling on all the horrors of war. Did the Black Prince think of the massacre of Limoges? June 2, 1374 (vol. xxvii.). Among other powers the Nuncios have that of consecrating or ordering consecration of churches, and of purifying cemeteries polluted by the burial of excommunicated persons; having first exhumed and cast out their bodies, if they could be discerned. March 9, 1371. They have very large powers of granting benefices, of visiting monasteries, described, as, in England, in great need of visitation. One hundred women, *of high birth and rank*, to be named by the Nuncios; some of them, with four "honest matrons," were to enter and visit any convent of females, but not to eat or sleep therein. The Nuncios have power to absolve thirty persons who have committed homicide or mutilation on deacons or archdeacons, with a form of penance, scourging in the church. There are several of these powers of absolution; one for the homicide of priests. The clergy should seem to have fared ill, or to have exposed themselves in these wars.

¹ There is a curious history of the Free Companies by Ricotti, which,

In the north the Viscontis were all-powerful; the wretched government of the Papal Legates raised the whole south in one wide revolt.¹ Even in Florence, Ghibellinism was in the ascendant. A league was formed, after some years, which comprehended the Viscontis, Joanna of Naples, Florence, Pisa, Sienna, Lucca, Arezzo, against the iniquitous ecclesiastical rule. Viterbo, Montefiascone, Narni, raised the banner of liberty; in the next month, Perugia, Assisi, Spoleto, Gubbio, Urbino, Cagli, Fermo. Though the Cardinal Legate let loose John Hawkwood, now in the pay of the Church, in a few days eighty cities, castles, and fortresses had thrown off the Papal rule. Early in the next year followed Ascoli, Civita Vecchia, Ravenna, and other cities. Bologna drove out the Cardinal, who fled in disguise. Forlì raised the standard of the Ordellaffi. Hawkwood, now receiving no pay, paid himself by the sack of Faenza. Imola, Camerino, Macerata, fell under the dominion of the Alidori and Rodolf di Vacano.

The Pope had no resources but in the wealth at his command. The tenths were levied in all the remote kingdoms of Christendom—in Po-^{Tenths levied for war in Italy.} land, Hungary, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, even in the British Isles²—to subjugate the immedi-

with some other recent works, does credit to the Italian modern school of history.

¹ 1375. Muratori, Ann. sub ann.

² March 10, 1372, Gregory XI. writes to the Archbishop and Bishops of England, describing the enormous expenses of the Roman See in Italy, the usurpation of the Papal rights and territories. He has obtained subsidies from the Prelates and clergy of France, Spain, Germany, and almost all the faithful in Christ, *except the kingdom of England*. He urges a subsidy, seemingly a voluntary one, in England.—MS., B. M., March 10, 1372.

ate subjects of the patrimony of St. Peter.¹ Wealth could raise armies: in those calamitous times there were soldiers to be hired for any cause. A formidable force of wild and barbarous Bretons was levied: the fears of Italy magnified them to fourteen thousand, they were at the least four thousand men. Under the command of the Cardinal Robert of Geneva, unopposed by the Visconti (the Pope, by the surrender of Vercelli A.D. 1376. and other cities, had bought off Galeazzo Visconti), they were let loose on wretched Romagna. They achieved no conquests: but by their excesses they made the Papal sway only more profoundly odious.

None but the Pope himself could restore the Papal power. He must himself rule in Italy, or cease to rule. The mind of Gregory XI. was already shaken:² he had rebuked a non-resident prelate. "Why do you not betake yourself to your diocese?" "Why do you not betake yourself to yours?" was the taunting reply.

¹ Throughout it is the war urged by the Viscontis, Bernabo and Galeazzo, those sons of iniquity, which enforces and justifies his exactions on the English Church. At one time he demands 100,000 gold florins (July 1, 1372), at another 60,000. It is a case when, according to the Constitutions of the Council of Vienne, they might pawn their chalices, books, the ornaments of churches and altars. The Pope implores the King not to impede the collection, as he is a Catholic prince of Catholic parents (the King's officers (*gentes*) had been guilty of this), nor to favor the contumacious clergy who will not pay. The letter to Edward is submissively urgent; no menace of censure. Afterwards the Bishop of Lincoln and the King's justiciaries are cited to Avignon for impeding the collection. See next vol., c. iii.

² Above two years before his return he writes to King Edward III. (Jan. 9, 1375): "*Etsi debitum honestatis exposcat ut sacram urbem, in qua principalis sedes nostra consistit, personaliter visitemus . . . ut quam cito commode fieri poterit accedamus.*" He adds the further he is distant, the more the Church in England requires the support of the King; he commends it to the care of Edward. He positively states his intention of being in Rome the autumn of that year, 1375.

An ambassador of a singular character accepted a mission from Florence to reconcile that city with the Pope. Catherine of Sienna was at the height of her fame for sanctity.¹ Already she had sent to the Pope a solemn admonition to name worthy Cardinals. She appeared at Avignon; she urged, she implored the Pope to return to Italy. The visions of another saint, St. Brigitta of Sweden, had been long full of the same heaven-inspired remonstrances; Christ had spoken by that holy virgin.

The commission, however, intrusted to St. Catherine of Sienna for the reconciliation of contumacious Florence failed till, after the accession of Urban VI., her

¹ One most extraordinary letter of St. Catherine of Sienna may illustrate the times, the woman, the religion: it is addressed to her confessor, Raymond of Capua, who was at Rome. When she wrote it she can hardly have been more than 32. She urges Raymond in the most rapturous phrases to hide himself in the wounded side of the Son of God. (St. Catherine herself, says her biographer, was permitted constantly to approach her lips to the side of the Lord, and to quaff his blood.) "It is a dwelling full of delicious odors; even sin takes a sweet perfume." "Oh blood! oh fire! oh ineffable love!" But the object of the letter is to relate the execution of a man, young or old does not appear, nor for what crime he suffered, but there can be little doubt that it was political, not religious. The day before his death she conducted him to the Mass; he received the Eucharist, from which he had before kept aloof. The rest of the day was passed in ineffable spiritual transports. "Remain with me," he said, "and I shall die content." His head reposed on her bosom. She awaited him next morning on the scaffold; she laid her head down on the block; she obtained not what she ardently desired. He came at length, suffered his fate with the gentleness of a lamb, uttering the name of the Saviour. She received his head in her hands. At that moment appeared to her the God-Man with the brightness of the sun. She was assured of her friend's salvation. She would not wash off the stain of the rich-smelling blood from her garments. Yet, though she must remain on earth, the first stone of her tomb was laid. "Sweet Jesus! Jesus Love!" My attention was directed to this remarkable letter (the 97th in Gigli's edition) by a translation in the *Annales Archéologiques*, vol. xi. p. 85. St. Catherine had the stigmata. And this woman interposed between Popes, Princes, and Republics!

words wrought with irresistible influence on the more than wavering Pope. Gregory XI., notwithstanding the opposition of the Cardinals, though six of them remained at Avignon, embarked, like his predecessor, at Marseilles,¹ put in at Genoa, and then landed near Corneto. His voyage was not so prosperous, many ships were lost, the Bishop of Lucca was drowned. The Pope passed the Feast of the Nativity at Corneto. On the seventeenth day after, he arrived by sea, and sailed up the Tiber to Rome. All was outward splendor and rejoicing in Rome, processions through decorated streets, banquets, a jubilant people, every one prostrate before the successor of St. Peter.² But before long the Bannerets of the Regions, who had cast down their ensigns of authority at the feet of the Pontiff, resumed their independent rule. De Vico, the Prefect of the city, held Viterbo and Montefiascone; not a city returned to its allegiance. The sack of Faenza and Cesena by the sanguinary Cardinal Robert and his Bretons, and by the soldiers of Hawkwood, whom he called to his aid, deepened, if it could be deepened, the aversion; scenes of rape and bloodshed, which even shocked those times, were perpetrated under the Papal banner.

¹ He was at Marseilles, Sept. 29; at Genoa, Oct. 23-4; St. Peter's, Rome, April 1377. — Documents in MS., B. M.

² Compare the account in rude verse by Peter, Bishop of Senigaglia: —

"Egrediente summo Pontifice S. Pauli palatium affuerunt mille histriones . . .
Verè non credebam in præsentì sæculo videre tantam gloriam oculis propriis.
Dire fatigatur Præsul prolixitate itineris cum suis servulis . . .
Membra fatigata debilitataque magnificè gemmatis fœculis refocillavimus."

Apud Raynald. 1377, 1.

The whole dreary but curious poem, which describes minutely the journey from Avignon to Marseilles, the voyage from Marseilles to Corneto, from Corneto to Rome, the retirement to Anagni, may be read, if it can be read, in Ciacconius and in Muratori.

Gregory had the barren consolation, that beyond the Alps he had still some power. The Emperor Charles IV. humbly sought his influence to obtain the succession for his son Wenceslaus. Even in Italy, wherever his authority was acceptable, it was admitted. Sicily was erected into an independent kingdom, that of Trinacria.

But neither the awe of his spiritual authority, though he launched excommunication and interdict with unwearied hand, nor his gentler virtues, could allay the evils which seventy years of absence of the Popes from Rome had allowed to grow up. During the retreat of Gregory from the heats of the summer to Anagni were made some approaches to pacification with the Prefect de Vico and with Florence. The Pope despatched the holy Catherine of Sienna to Florence as a mediator of peace. But the delays of the Saint, and her intercourse with some of the Guelfic leaders in somewhat of a worldly and political spirit, inflamed the fury of the adverse factions.¹ They threatened to seize and burn the wicked woman. She hardly escaped political martyrdom.

But these negotiations dragged heavily on. A great congress was held at Sarzana. The main difficulty was a demand by the Pope for the

Negotiations
with Florence.

¹ "Cum hæc sacra virgo me teste (her biographer and confessor) de mandato felicis memoriæ D. Gregorii hujus nominis Papæ XI. accessisset Florentiam (quæ pro tunc rebellis erat et contumax in conspectu Ecclesiæ) pro pace tractandâ inter Pastorem et oves, ibique multas persecutiones injustas fuisset passa . . . nullo modo voluit recedere, quousque defuncto Gregorio, Urbanus VI., successor ejus pacem fecit cum Florentinis prædictis." It will reconcile this with the text, if it is supposed that she went to Avignon before on a mission from one of the parties in Florence. Urban VI. afterwards sent for her to Rome, through her confessor. She went unwillingly, but went. — Vit. apud Bolland. c. i. p. 111. Alban Butler has told well, though not quite fully, the life of Catherine of Sienna. — April 30.

reimbursement of 800,000 florins expended in the war through the contumacy of the Florentines. The Florentines retorted that the war was caused by the maladministration of the Cardinal Legates.

Pope Gregory, worn out with disease and disappointment, and meditating his return to Avignon, died, leaving all in irreparable confusion, confusion to be still aggravated by the consequences of his death.¹

Death of
Gregory XI.
March 27 or
28, 1378.

With Gregory XI. terminated the Babylonish captivity of the Popedom, succeeded by the great schism which threatened to divide Latin Christendom in perpetuity between two lines of successors of St. Peter, finally to establish a Transalpine and a Cisalpine Pope.²

¹ Muratori, sub ann.

² The will of Pope Gregory XI. may be read in D'Achery, iii. p. 738. The whole gives a high notion of his character as a man of conscience and piety. There is this singular passage: "Quod si in Consistorio aut in publicis consiliis ex lapsu linguæ, vel etiam lætitiâ inordinatâ, aut præsentâ magnatum ad eorum forsan complacentiam, seu ex aliquali distemperantiâ aut superfluitate aliquâ dixerimus errores contra Catholicam fidem . . . seu forsitan adhærendo aliquorum opinionibus contrariis fidei Catholicæ, scienter, quod non credimus, vel etiam ignoranter, aut dando favorem aliquibus contra Catholicam religionem obloquentibus, illa expressè et specialiter revocamus, detestamur et habere volumus pro non dictis." Is not this to be taken as illustrating the free conversation at the court of Avignon? See also the very curious account of the interview of Gregory XI. with two of the German Friends of God, Nicolas of Basle (see Book xiv. c. 7.), the friend of Tauler—the anger of the Pope at being rebuked by two such plain-spoken men, his gentleness and meekness, and friendliness, when he discovered their deep and earnest piety.—Karl Schmidt, *Der Gottesfreund* in XIV. Jahrhundert.

BOOK XIII.

CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

POPES.		EMPERORS OF GERMANY.		KINGS OF FRANCE.		KINGS OF ENGLAND.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1278 Urban VI.	1280	1278 Wenceslaus	1400	Charles V.	1380		
1278 Clement VII. (Antipope)	1384			1380 Charles VI.	1422		
1280 Boniface IX.	1404					Richard II.	1399
1284 Benedict XIII. (Antipope)	1423	1400 Rupert	1410			1390 Henry IV.	1413
1404 Innocent VII.	1406						
1406 Gregory XII.	1415						
1409 (Council of Pisa)		1410 Sigismund	1498			1413 Henry V.	1422
Alexander V.	1410					1422 Henry VI.	
1420 John XXIII.	1415						
1427 Martin V.	1421			1422 Charles VII.		ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.	
1431 Eugenius IV.	1447	1428 Albert II. (of Austria)	1440			Simon Sudbury	1381
1439 Felix V. (Antipope)	1448	1440 Frederick III. (of Austria).				1381 William Courtenay.	
1457 Nicolas V.	1454					1397 Thomas Arundel.	
						1398 Roger Walden (substitute).	
						1398 Arundel	1414
						1414 Henry Chicheley	1443
						1443 John Stafford	1493
						1453 John Kemp.	
KINGS OF SCOTLAND.		KINGS OF NAPLES.		KINGS OF SPAIN.		EMPERORS OF THE EAST.	
A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
		Joanna	1282	CASTILE.		John V. Palaeologus	1291
		1282 Charles III. (of Durazzo)	1286	Henry II.	1279	1301 Manuel	1494
		1286 Ladislaus	1414	1279 John I.	1290	1494 John VI.	1446
Robert II.	1390			1290 Henry III.	1400	1446 Constantine.	
1290 Robert III.	1406			1406 John II.	1458		
				ARRAGON.			
				Peter IV.	1287		
1404 James I.	1438			1287 John I.	1296		
		1414 Joanna	1494	1296 Martin	1410		
				1410 Ferdinand	1415		
				1415 Alphonsus V.			
				KINGS OF PORTUGAL.			
		1494 Alfonso (of Arragon).				A.D.	A.D.
1420 James II.						Amurat I.	1380
				A.D.	A.D.	1380 Bajazet I.	1403
				Ferdinand	1284	1403 Soliman	1410
				1285 John I.	1433	1410 Musa	1413
				1433 Edward.		1413 Mahomet I.	1421
				1433 Alphonsus V.		1421 Amurat II.	1460
						1450 Mahomet II.	

BOOK XIII.

CHAPTER I.

THE SCHISM.

GREGORY XI. had hardly expired when Rome burst out into a furious tumult. A Roman Pope, at least an Italian Pope, was the universal outcry. The Conclave must be overawed ; the hateful domination of a foreign, a French Pontiff must be broken up, and forever. This was not unforeseen. Before his death Gregory XI. had issued a Bull,¹ conferring the amplest powers on the Cardinals to choose, according to their wisdom, the time and the place for the election. It manifestly contemplated their retreat from the turbulent streets of Rome to some place where their deliberations would not be overborne, and the predominant French interest would maintain its superiority. On the other hand there were serious and not groundless apprehensions that the fierce Breton and Gascon bands, at the command of the French Cardinals, might dictate to the Conclave. The Romans not only armed their civic troops, but sent to Tivoli, Velletri, and the neighboring cities ; a strong force was mustered to keep the foreigners in check. Throughout the interval between the funeral of Gregory and

March 27,
1378.

The Con-
clave.

¹ The Bull in Raynald. 1378.

the opening of the Conclave, the Cardinals were either too jealously watched, or thought it imprudent to attempt flight. Sixteen Cardinals were present at Rome,¹ one Spaniard, eleven French, four Italians.² The ordinary measures were taken for open- April 7. ing the Conclave in the palace near St. Peter's. Five Romans, two ecclesiastics and three laymen, and three Frenchmen were appointed to wait upon and to guard the Conclave. The Bishop of Marseilles represented the great Chamberlain, who holds the supreme authority during the vacancy of the Popedom. The Chamberlain the Archbishop of Arles, brother of the Cardinal of Limoges, had withdrawn into the Castle of St. Angelo, to secure his own person, and to occupy that important fortress.

The nine solemn days fully elapsed, on the 7th of April they assembled for the Conclave. At that instant (inauspicious omen !) a terrible flash of lightning, followed by a stunning peal of thunder, struck through the hall, burning and splitting some of the furniture. The Hall of Conclave was crowded by a fierce rabble, who refused to retire. After about an hour's strife, the Bishop of Marseilles, by threats, by persuasion, or by entreaty, had expelled all but about forty wild men, armed to the teeth. These ruffians rudely and insolently searched the whole building ; they looked under the beds, they examined the places of retreat. They

¹ See in Sismondi, *Répub. Ital.* vii. p. 107 (or in Ciacconius), the list of the Cardinals, and their titles. Sismondi throughout has followed Thomas de Acerno. But perhaps Acerno's account is rather suspicious, as his object was to prove the legitimacy of the election of Urban VI. This was supposed to depend on the election not having been compulsory ; but if one thing be clear, it is that the majority would have preferred a French Pope. — Baluz. in *Not.* p. 1065.

² Orsini, Florence. Milan. St. Peter's.

would satisfy themselves whether any armed men were concealed, whether there was any hole, or even drain through which the Cardinals could escape. All the time they shouted, "A Roman Pope! we will have a Roman Pope!" Those without echoed back the savage yell.¹ Before long appeared two ecclesiastics, Roman delegates. announcing themselves as delegated by the commonalty of Rome; they demanded to speak with the Cardinals. The Cardinals dared not refuse. The Romans represented, in firm but not disrespectful language, that for seventy years the holy Roman people had been without their pastor, the supreme head of Christendom. In Rome were many noble and wise ecclesiastics equal to govern the Church: if not in Rome, there were such men in Italy. They intimated that so great was the fury and determination of the people, that if the Conclave should resist, there might be a general massacre, in which probably they themselves, assuredly the Cardinals, would perish. The Cardinals might hear from every quarter around them the cry, "A Roman Pope! if not a Roman, an Italian!" The Cardinals replied, that such aged and reverend men must know the rules of the Conclave; that no election could be by requisition, favor, fear, or tumult, but by the interposition of the Holy Ghost. To reiterated persuasions and menaces they only said, "We are in your power; you may kill us, but we must act according to God's ordinance. To-morrow we celebrate the Mass for the descent of the Holy

¹ The accounts of this remarkable transaction are perhaps less contradictory than at first appears. Some are from eye-witnesses, or from persons in the confidence of one or other of the Cardinals. That in the second Life of Gregory XI. (apud Baluzium) has to me strong internal marks of truth in its minuteness and graphic reality.

Ghost ; as the Holy Ghost directs, so shall we do." Some of the French uttered words which sounded like defiance. The populace cried, "If ye persist to do despite to Christ, if we have not a Roman Pope, we will hew these Cardinals and Frenchmen in pieces." At length the Bishop of Marseilles was able entirely to clear the hall. The Cardinals sat down to a plentiful repast ; the doors were finally closed. But all the night through they heard in the streets the unceasing clamor, "A Roman Pope, a Roman Pope !" Towards the morning the tumult became more fierce and dense. Strange men had burst into the belfry of St. Peter's ; the clanging bells tolled as if all Rome was on fire.

Within the Conclave the tumult, if less loud and clamorous, was hardly less general. The confusion without and terror within did not allay the angry rivalry, or suspend that subtle play of policy peculiar to the form of election. The French interest was divided ; within this circle there was another circle. The single diocese of Limoges, favored as it had been by more than one Pope, had almost strength to dictate to the Conclave. The Limousins put forward the Cardinal de St. Eustache. Against these the leader was the Cardinal Robert of Geneva, whose fierce and haughty demeanor and sanguinary acts as Legate had brought so much of its unpopularity on the administration of Gregory XI. With Robert were the four Italians and three French Cardinals.¹ Rather than a Limousin, Robert would even consent to an Italian. They on the one side, the Limousins on the other, had met secretly before the Conclave : the eight had sworn not on

¹ There were five, — Limoges, Aigrefeuille, Poitou, Majoris Monasterii (St. Martin in Tours), and de Verny.

any account to submit to the election of a traitorous Limousin.¹

All the sleepless night the Cardinals might hear the din at the gate, the yells of the people, the tolling of the bells. There was constant passing and repassing from each other's chambers, intrigues, altercations, manœuvres, proposals advanced and rejected, promises of support given and withdrawn. Many names were put up. Of the Romans within the Conclave two only were named, the old Cardinal of St. Peter's, the Cardinal Jacobo Orsini. The Limousins advanced in turn almost every one of their faction; no one but himself thought of Robert of Geneva.

In the morning the disturbance without waxed more terrible. A vain attempt was made to address the populace by the three Cardinal Priors; they were driven from the windows with loud derisive shouts, "A Roman! A Roman!" For now the alternative of an Italian had been abandoned; a Roman, none but a Roman, would content the people. The madness of intoxication was added to the madness of popular fury. The rabble had broken open the Pope's cellar, and drunk his rich wines.² In the Conclave the wildest projects were started. The Cardinal Orsini's was to dress up a Minorite Friar (probably a Spiritual) in the Papal robes, to show him to the people, and so for themselves to effect their escape to some safe place, and proceed to a legitimate election. The Cardinals, from honor or from fear, shrunk from this trick.

¹ See in Raynaldus the statement of the Bishop of Cassano, the confidential friend of Robert of Geneva.

² "Sitibundi et sitientes, volentes bibere de bono vino Papali, aperuerunt cellarium Domini Papæ, in quo erant vina Græca, Garnaria, Malvoisia, et diversa alia vina bona." — Thomas de Acerno. apud Murator. iii.

At length both parties seemed to concur. Each claimed credit for first advancing the name, ^{Archbishop} which most afterwards repudiated, of the ^{of Bari.} Archbishop of Bari, a man of repute for theologic and legal erudition, an Italian, but a subject of the Queen of Naples, who was also Countess of Provence. They came to the nomination. The Cardinal of Florence proposed the Cardinal of St. Peter's. The Cardinal of Limoges arose, "The Cardinal of St. Peter's is too old. The Cardinal of Florence is of a city at war with the Holy See. I reject the Cardinal of Milan as the subject of the Visconti, the most deadly enemy of the Church. The Cardinal Orsini is too young, and we must not yield to the clamor of the Romans. I vote for Bartholomew Prignani, Archbishop of Bari."¹ All was acclamation; Orsini alone stood out: he aspired to be the Pope of the Romans.

But it was too late; the mob was thundering at the gates, menacing death to the Cardinals, if they had not immediately a Roman Pontiff. The feeble defences sounded as if they were shattering down; the tramp of the populace was almost heard within the Hall. They forced or persuaded the aged Cardinal of St. Peter's to make a desperate effort to save their lives. He appeared at the window, hastily attired in what either was or seemed to be the Papal stole and mitre. There was a jubilant and triumphant cry, "We have a Roman Pope, the Cardinal of St. Peter's. Long live Rome! long live St. Peter!" The populace became even more frantic with joy than before

¹ A Niem says, "Per electionem uniformem scilicet nemine eorum discrepante." — De Schism., c. 11.

with wrath. One band hastened to the Cardinal's palace, and, according to the strange usage, broke in, threw the furniture into the streets, and sacked it from top to bottom. Those around the Hall of Conclave, aided by the connivance of some of the Cardinals' servants within, or by more violent efforts of their own, burst in in all quarters. The supposed Pope was surrounded by eager adorers; they were at his feet; they pressed his swollen, gouty hands till he shrieked from pain, and began to protest, in the strongest language, that he was not the Pope.

The indignation of the populace at this disappointment was aggravated by an unlucky confusion of names. The Archbishop was mistaken for John of Bari, of the bedchamber of the late Pope, a man of harsh manners and dissolute life, an object of general hatred.¹ Five of the Cardinals, Robert of Geneva, Acquasparta, Viviers, Poitou, and De Verny, were seized in their attempt to steal away, and driven back, amid contemptuous hootings, by personal violence. Night came on again; the populace, having pillaged all the provisions in the Conclave, grew weary of their own excesses. The Cardinals fled on all sides. Four left the city; Orsini and St. Eustache escaped to Vicovaro, Robert of Geneva to Zagarolo, St. Angelo to Guardia; six, Limoges, D'Aigrefeuille, Poitou, Viviers, Brittany, and Marmoutiers, to the Castle of St. Angelo; Florence, Milan, Montmayeur, Glandève, and Luna, to their own strong fortresses.

The Pope lay concealed in the Vatican. In the

¹ "Jo. de Bari vulgariter nuncupatum, Gallicum seu de terrâ Lemovicensi oriendum, satis, ut fama erat, superbum, pariter et lascivum." — A Niem, c. 11.

morning the five Cardinals in Rome assembled round him. A message was sent to the Bannerets of Rome, announcing his election. The six ^{Election confirmed.} Cardinals in St. Angelo were summoned; they were hardly persuaded to leave their place of security; but without their presence the Archbishop would not declare his assent to his elevation. The Cardinal of Florence, as Dean, presented the Pope Elect to the Sacred College, and discoursed on the text, "Such ought he to be, an undefiled High Priest." The Archbishop began a long harangue, "Fear and trembling have ^{April 9.} come upon me, the horror of great darkness." The Cardinal of Florence cut short the ill-timed sermon, demanding whether he accepted the Pontificate. The Archbishop gave his assent; he took the name of Urban VI. *Te Deum* was intoned; he was lifted to the throne. The fugitives returned to Rome. Urban VI. was crowned on Easter Day, in the Church ^{Coronation. April 18.} of St. John Lateran. All the Cardinals were present at the august ceremony. They announced the election of Urban VI. to their brethren who had remained in Avignon.¹ Urban himself addressed the usual encyclic letters, proclaiming his elevation, to all the Prelates in Christendom.

None but He who could read the hearts of men could determine how far the nomination of the Archbishop of Bari was free and uncontrolled by the terrors of the raging populace; but the acknowledgment of Urban VI. by all the Cardinals, at his inauguration in the holy office—their assistance at his coronation without protest, when some at least might have been safe beyond the walls of Rome—their acceptance of honors,

¹ See in Raynaldus the letter and signatures.

as by the Cardinals of Limoges, Poitou, and Aigrefeuille — the homage of all¹ — might seem to annul all possible irregularity in the election, to confirm irrefragably the legitimacy of his title.

Not many days had passed, when the Cardinals began to look with dismay and bitter repentance on their own work. "In Urban VI.," said a writer of these times² (on the side of Urban as rightful Pontiff), "was verified the proverb — None is so insolent as a low man suddenly raised to power." The high-born, haughty, luxurious Prelates, both French and Italian, found that they had set over themselves a master resolved not only to redress the flagrant and inveterate abuses of the College and of the Hierarchy, but also to force on his reforms in the most hasty and insulting way. He did the harshest things in the harshest manner.

The Archbishop of Bari, of mean birth, had risen by the virtues of a monk. He was studious, austere, humble,³ a diligent reader of the Bible,⁴ master of the canon law, rigid in his fasts; he

Character of
Urban VI.

¹ The Cardinal of Amiens, absent as Legate in Tuscany, came to Rome to do homage to the Pope. — Raynald. sub ann. No. xx.

Thus writes St. Catherine of Sienna, a resolute partisan of Pope Urban VI.: "Questo annunciarono a noi e a voi, e a li altri signori del mondo, manifestando per opera quello ch'è dicevano con parole: cioè facendoli reverentia, e adorandolo com'è Christo in terra e coronandolo con tanta solennità, rifacendo di novo la electione con grande concordia, a lui come sommo Pontefice chieseron le grazie e usaronle. E se non fusse vero ch'è Papa Urbano fosse Papa, e che l' havessero eletto per paura, non sarebbero essi degni di eterna confusione; che le colonne poste per dilatare la fede per timore di la morte corporale volessen dare a loro e a noi morte eternale . . . e non sarebbero essi idolatri, adorando per Christo in terra, quel che non fosse." — Al Rè di Francia, Epist. xcvi.

² Theodore à Niem, De Schism. l. i. c. 7.

³ "Ante Papatum homo humilis et devotus, et retrahens manus suas ab omni munere, inimicus et persecutor symoniarum, zelator caritatis et justitiæ, sed nimis suæ prudentiæ innitendo et credens adulatoribus," &c.

⁴ In person he was "brevis staturæ et spissus, coloris lividi sive fusi."

wore hair-cloth next his skin. His time was divided between study, prayer, and business, for which he had great aptitude. From the poor bishopric of Acherontia he had been promoted to the archbishopric of Bari, and had presided over the Papal Chancery in Avignon. The monk broke out at once on his elevation in the utmost rudeness and rigor, but the humility changed to the most offensive haughtiness. Almost his first act was a public rebuke in his chapel to all the Bishops present for their desertion of their dioceses. He called them perjured traitors.¹ The Bishop of Pampeluna boldly repelled the charge; he was at Rome, he said, on the affairs of his see. In the full Consistory Urban preached on the text "I am the good Shepherd," and inveighed in a manner not to be mistaken against the wealth and luxury of the Cardinals. Their voluptuous banquets were notorious (Petrarch had declaimed against them). The Pope threatened a sumptuary law, that they should have but one dish at their table: it was the rule of his own Order. He was determined to extirpate simony. A Cardinal who should receive presents he menaced with excommunication. He affected to despise wealth. "Thy money perish with thee!" he said to a collector of the Papal revenue. He disdained to conceal the most unpopular schemes; he declared his intention not to leave Rome. To the petition of the Bannerets of Rome for a promotion of Cardinals, he openly avowed his design to make so large a nomination that the Italians should resume their ascendancy over the Ultramontanes. The Cardinal of

— A Niem, liv. i. ch. i. He often before his papacy made à Niem read the Bible to him till he fell asleep.

¹ "Me présente," writes à Niem, c. 111.

Geneva turned pale, and left the Consistory. Urban declared himself determined to do equal justice between man and man, between the Kings of France and England. The French Cardinals, and those in the pay of France, heard this with great indignation.¹

The manners of Urban were even more offensive than his acts. "Hold your tongue!" "You have talked long enough!" were his common phrases to his mitred counsellors. He called the Cardinal Orsini a fool. He charged the Cardinal of St. Marcellus (of Amiens), on his return from his legation in Tuscany, with having robbed the treasures of the Church. The charge was not less insulting for its justice. The Cardinal of Amiens, instead of allaying the feuds of France and England, which it was his holy mission to allay, had inflamed them in order to glut his own insatiable avarice by draining the wealth of both countries in the Pope's name.² "As Archbishop of Bari, you lie," was the reply of the high-born Frenchman. On one occasion such high words passed with the Cardinal of Limoges, that but for the interposition of another Cardinal the Pope would have rushed on him, and there had been a personal conflict.³

Such were among the stories of the time. Friends

¹ Raynaldus, sub ann.

² So writes Walsingham: — "Cum sæpius missus fuisset a Papâ Gregorio prædecessore suo, ut quoquomodo pacem inter Angliæ et Franciæ regna firmaret, et ipse inestimabiles auri et argenti summas, pro labore sui itineris jussu Papæ de utroque regno cepisset, omisso suæ legationis officio non curavit paci providere regnorum, sed potius elaboravit, ut dissensiones et odia continuarentur inter reges diutius, et dum ipse descenderet taliter sub umbrâ firmandæ concordiæ, rediretque multotiens infecto negotio, suo provideret uberius nefando marsupio de male quæsitâ pecuniâ relevatâ de Christi patrimonio, utroque regno sophistice spoliato." — Walsingham, p. 216.

³ Baluz., note, p. 1067.

and foes agree in attributing the schism, at least the immediate schism, to the imprudent zeal, the imperiousness, the ungovernable temper of Pope Urban.¹ The Cardinals among themselves talked of him as mad;² they began to murmur that it was a compulsory, therefore invalid, election.³

The French Cardinals were now at Anagni: they were joined by the Cardinal of Amiens, who had taken no part in the election, but who was burning under the insulting words of the Pope, perhaps not too eager to render an account of his legation. The Pope retired to Tivoli; he summoned the Cardinals to that city. They answered that they had gone to large expenses in laying in provisions and making preparations for their residence in Anagni; they had no means to supply a second sojourn in Tivoli. The Pope, with his four Italian Cardinals, passed two important acts as Sovereign Pontiff. He confirmed the election of Wenceslaus, son of Charles IV., to the Empire; he completed the treaty with Florence by which the Republic paid a

¹ "Talis fuit Dominus noster post coronationem suam asper et rigorosus, nescitur tamen, utrum ex divinâ voluntate, quum certè ante creationem suam fuerit multum humilis, amabilis et benignus." — A Niem. Catherine of Sienna remonstrates with the Pope on his bursts of passion: — "Mitigate un poco, per l' amore di Christo crocifisso quelli movimenti subiti — date il volto a natura come Dio v'ha dato il core grande naturalmente." These sudden passions were to him vituperio e danno de l' anime. — Epist. xix. Compare the following Epistle.

² This account of Thomas di Acerno, Bishop of Luceria, is as it were the official statement of Urban's party, which accompanied the letter to the King of Castile.

³ Thomas di Acerno gives six causes for the alienation of the Cardinals: I. The sumptuary limitation of their meals. II. The prohibition of simony of all kinds under pain of excommunication: this included the Cardinals. III. His projected promotion of Cardinals. IV. The determination to remain at Rome. V. His insulting demeanor and language to the Cardinals. VI. His refusal to go to Anagni, and his summons to Tivoli.

large sum to the See of Rome. The amount was 70,000 florins in the course of the year, 180,000 in four years, for the expenses of the war. They were relieved from ecclesiastical censures, under which this enlightened Republic, though Italian, trembled, even from a Pope of doubtful title. Their awe showed perhaps the weakness and dissensions in Florence rather than the Papal power.

The Cardinals at Anagni sent a summons to their July 20. brethren inviting them to share in their counsels concerning the compulsory election of the successor to Gregory XI. Already the opinions of great legists had been taken; some of them, that of the famous Baldus,¹ may still be read. He was in favor of the validity of the election.

But grave legal arguments and ecclesiastical logic were not to decide a contest which had stirred so deeply the passions and interests of two great factions. France and Italy were at strife for the Popedom. The Ultramontane Cardinals would not tamely abandon a power which had given them rank, wealth, luxury, virtually the spiritual supremacy of the world, for seventy years. Italy, Rome, would not forego the golden opportunity of resuming the long-lost authority. On the 9th August the Cardinals at Anagni publicly declared, they announced in encyclic letters addressed to the faithful in all Christendom, that the election of Urban VI. was carried by force and the fear of death; that through the same force and fear he had been inaugurated, enthroned, and crowned; that he was an apostate, an accursed Antichrist. They pro-

Declaration
of Cardinals
at Anagni.

¹ Opera Baldi, vol. vi., and summarily in Raynaldus, sub ann. 1738, c. xxxvi.

nounced him a tyrannical usurper of the Popedom, a wolf that had stolen into the fold. They called upon him to descend at once from the throne which he occupied without canonical title; if repentant, he might find mercy; if he persisted, he would provoke the indignation of God, of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the Saints, for his violation of the Spouse of Christ, the common Mother of the Faithful.¹ It was signed by thirteen Cardinals. The more pious and devout were shocked at this avowal of cowardice; Cardinals who would not be martyrs in the cause of truth and of spiritual freedom condemned themselves.

But letters and appeals to the judgment of the world, and awful maledictions, were not their only resources. The fierce Breton bands were used to march and to be indulged in their worst excesses under the banner of the Cardinal of Geneva. As Ultramontanists it was their interest, their inclination, to espouse the Ultramontane cause. They arrayed themselves to advance and join the Cardinals at Anagni. The Romans rose to oppose them; a fight took place near the Ponte Salaro, three hundred Romans lay dead on the field.

Urban VI. was as blind to cautious temporal as to cautious ecclesiastical policy. Every act of imprudent the Pope raised him up new enemies. ^{acts of} Joan- Urban VI. na, Queen of Naples, had hailed the elevation of her subject the Archbishop of Bari. Naples had been brilliantly illuminated. Shiploads of fruit and wines, and the more solid gift of 20,000 florins, had been her oblations to the Pope. Her husband, Otho of Brunswick, had gone to Rome to pay his personal homage. His object was to determine in his own favor the succession

¹ Document in Raynaldus, and in the Gersoniana.

to the realm. The reception of Otho was cold and repulsive; he returned in disgust.¹ The Queen eagerly listened to suspicions, skilfully awakened, that Urban meditated the resumption of the fief of Naples, and its grant to the rival House of Hungary. She became the sworn ally of the Cardinals at Anagni. Honorato Gaetani, Count of Fondi, one of the most turbulent barons of the land, demanded of the Pontiff 20,000 florins advanced on loan to Gregory XI. Urban not only rejected the claim, declaring it a personal debt of the late Pope, not of the Holy See, he also deprived Gaetani of his fief, and granted it to his mortal enemy, the Count San Severino. Gaetani began immediately to seize the adjacent castles in Campania, and invited the Cardinals to his stronghold at Fondi. The Archbishop of Arles, Chamberlain of the late Pope, leaving the Castle of St. Angelo under the guard of a commander who long refused all orders from Pope Urban, brought to Anagni the jewels and ornaments of the Papacy, which had been carried for security to St. Angelo. The Prefect of the city, De Vico, Lord of Viterbo, had been won over by the Cardinal of Amiens.

The four Italian Cardinals still adhered to Pope Urban. They labored hard to mediate between the conflicting parties. Conferences were held at Zagarolo Aug. 20. and other places; when the French Cardinals had retired to Fondi, the Italians took up their quarters at Subiaco. The Cardinal of St. Peter's, worn out with age and trouble, withdrew to Rome, and soon after died. He left a testamentary document declaring the validity of the election of Urban. The French

¹ A Niem, i. c. vi. Compare letters of Catherine of Sienna to the Queen of Naples.

Cardinals had declared the election void ; they were debating the next step. Some suggested the appointment of a coadjutor. They were now sure of the support of the King of France, who would not easily surrender his influence over a Pope at Avignon, and of the Queen of Naples, estranged by the pride of Urban, and secretly stimulated by the Cardinal Orsini, who had not forgiven his own loss of the tiara. Yet even now they seemed to shrink from the creation of an Antipope. Urban precipitated and made inevitable this disastrous event. He was now alone ;¹ the Cardinal of St. Peter's was dead ; Florence, Milan, and the Orsini stood aloof ; they seemed only to wait to be thrown off by Urban, to join the adverse faction. Urban at first declared his intention to create nine Cardinals ; he proceeded at once, and without warning, to create twenty-six.² By this step the French and Italian Cardinals together were now but an insignificant minority. They were instantly one. All must be risked, or all lost.

On September 20, at Fondi, Robert of Geneva was elected Pope in the presence of all the Cardinals (except St. Peter's) who had chosen, Or Quatuor Tempora, Sept. 16. inaugurated, enthroned, and for a time obeyed Clement VII. Urban VI. The Italians refused to give their suffrages, but entered no protest. They retired into their castles, and remained aloof from the schism. Orsini died before long at Tagliacozzo. The qualifications which, according to his partial biographer, recommended the Cardinal of Geneva, were rather those of a successor to John Hawkwood or to a Duke of Milan, than of the

¹ Like a sparrow on the house-top. — A Niem, i. xi.

² Some authorities give twenty-nine.

Apostles. Extraordinary activity of body and endurance of fatigue, courage which would hazard his life to put down the intrusive Pope, sagacity and experience in the temporal affairs of the Church; high birth, through which he was allied with most of the royal and princely houses of Europe: of austerity, devotion, learning, holiness, charity, not a word.¹ He took the name of Clement VII.: the Italians bitterly taunted the mockery of this name, assumed by the Captain of the Breton Free Companies — by the author, it was believed, of the massacre at Cesena.²

So began the Schism which divided Western Christendom for thirty-eight years. Italy, except-
Schism.
1375-1418. ing the kingdom of Joanna of Naples, adhered to her native Pontiff; Germany and Bohemia to the Pontiff who had recognized King Wenceslaus as Emperor; England to the Pontiff hostile to France;³ Hungary to the Pontiff who might support her pretensions to Naples; Poland and the Northern kingdoms, with Portugal, espoused the same cause. France at first stood almost alone in support of her subject, of a Pope at Avignon instead of at Rome. Scotland only was with Clement, because England was with Urban.

¹ Vit. I. apud Baluzium. A Niem agrees, and adds: "Unde potest elici, quod illa electio a Spiritu Sancto et puris conscientiis non processit." — Read Catherine of Sienna's letter to the Count of Fondi. Epist. cxciv. another hint of the furious passion of Urban VI.

² Collutius Pierius, apud Raynald. No. lvi.

³ Selden, in his Table Talk, says: "There was once, I am sure, a Parliamentary Pope. Pope Urban was made Pope in England by Act of Parliament, against Pope Clement: the Act is not in the Book of Statutes, either because he that compiled the book would not have the name of the Pope there, or else he would not let it appear that they meddled with any such thing; but it is upon the Rolls." — Artic. "Pope." Compare Walsingham. Ambassadors for both were in England. "Domino Deo favente repulsi sunt apostatici, admissi Papales." — p. 215.

So Flanders was with Urban because France was with Clement.¹ The uncommon abilities of Peter di Luna, the Spanish Cardinal (afterwards better known under a higher title), detached successively the Spanish kingdoms, Castile, Arragon, and Navarre, from allegiance to Pope Urban.

¹ "Exinde quanto plus divisi principes patronos sibi dilectos grato venerabantur aspectu, in eis plus excrescebat superbia et pertinacia dominandi, dum unus Alemanniam, Hungariam, Angliam et Hispaniam, sibi subditas cerneret, alter in Galliæ dulcissimo sinu foveretur, ditaretur, et ejus defenderetur viribus." — *Relig. de St. Denys*, i. p. 80.

CHAPTER II.

THE RIVAL POPES.

NEITHER of these Popes were men whom religious enthusiasm could raise into an idol ; they were men rather from whom profound devotional feeling could not but turn away abashed and confused. If the hard and arrogant demeanor of Urban might be excused when displayed only to the insolent and overbearing French Cardinals, or even justified as the severity of a Reformer of the Church, his subsequent acts of most revolting cruelty to his own partisans showed a type of that craft, treachery, and utter inhumanity which were hereafter to attain the bad Italian Popes. He might seem almost to confirm the charge of madness. On the other hand, the highest praise of Clement was that he was a sagacious and experienced politician, a valiant Captain of a Free Company.

The French Cardinals, the King of France, all parties at times spoke loudly of an Œcumenic Council. But who was to summon that Council ? how was it to be composed ? under whose auspices was it to sit, so that Christendom might have faith in the wisdom or justice of its determinations ? So long as the sole question was the validity of Urban's election, the Cardinals declared for a Council ; but no sooner had the Antipope been chosen, and the rival

General
Council.

claims must be disputed before this uncertain yet authoritative tribunal, than the Cardinals became averse to the measure, and started all possible difficulties. As Clement's party drew back, the Urbanists took up the cry, and clamorously defied their antagonists to meet them before an ecclesiastical Senate of Christendom.

The rival Popes had first recourse to their spiritual arms. Urban at the close of the year issued a long Brief, declaring four especially of the French Cardinals, among them the Archbishop of Arles, who had carried off the Papal crown and jewels, the Count of Fondi, and many other of the Romagnese ^{Acts of Urban.} and Campanian nobles, guilty of heresy, schism, treason, and apostasy. All were excommunicated; the Cardinals deposed; the nobles were degraded from their haughty order, their estates confiscated; all who had sworn fealty to them were released from their oaths: the usurping Pope was denominated Antichrist.

Clement VII. was not less authoritative or maledictory in his denunciations. The Roman or Clement. Pope was called upon to lay down his ill-gotten power. He too was an Antichrist, as opposing the College of Cardinals in their full right of electing a Pontiff, unawed by popular clamor or fear of death. From Fondi Clement went to Naples. Nothing could equal the magnificence of his reception. The Queen, her husband Otho of Brunswick, many of the nobles and great ecclesiastics kissed his feet.

But Urban in his first creation of twenty-six Cardinals in one day¹ had included many Neapolitans of the highest families and dignities in the kingdom, and had thus secured himself a strong interest. He had de-

¹ A Niem, i. xli.

graded Bernard di Montoro, the Archbishop of Naples, and appointed Bozzato, a man of influence and powerful connections in the city. The people had been somewhat jealously excluded from the splendid spectacle of Pope Clement's reception; they rose in their resentment; they declared that they would not desert a Neapolitan for a foreign Pope.¹ Urban's Archbishop set himself at their head. The Queen with great difficulty subdued the insurrection. Clement was so alarmed for his own safety that he fled rapidly to Fondi: and, not daring to rest there, embarked in all speed for Provence. He landed at Marseilles; and from that time, became the Pope of Avignon and France.

Urban's great difficulty was the disorder and poverty of his finances. The usual wealth which flowed to the Papal Court was interrupted by the confusion of the times. The Papal estates were wasted by war, occupied by his enemies, or by independent princes. Not only did he seize to his own use the revenues of all vacant benefices, and sell to the citizens of Rome property and rights of the churches and monasteries (from this traffic he got 40,000 florins); not only did he barter away the treasures of the churches, the gold and silver statues, crosses, images of saints, and all the splendid furniture; he had recourse to the extraordinary measure of issuing a commission to two of his new Cardinals to sell, impawn, and alienate the estates and property of the Church, even without the consent of the Bishops, Beneficed Clergy, or Monasteries.² Thus having hardly collected

A. D. 1380.
Successes
of Urban.

¹ Giannone, xxiii. 4.

² Muratori, Ann. sub ann. 1380. Urban appointed Cosmo Gentili, Chan-

sufficient funds, the Pope hired the services of Alberic Barbiano, Captain of one of the Free Companies, and prepared for open war. The Romans undertook the siege of the Castle of St. Angelo, which still held out for the Cardinals and continued to bombard the city. It was at length taken, but the Romans, instead of surrendering it to the Pope, razed the fortress, so long hostile to their liberties, nearly to the ground. The Romans, if they loved not the Pope, had the most cordial detestation of the French. The Pope's courtiers of ultramontane birth or opinions, all indeed except a few Germans and English, were insulted, robbed, treated with every contumely. "I have seen," writes one present, "Roman matrons, to excite the mob against them, spit in the faces of the courtiers."¹ Before the close of the year, Pope Urban could announce to Christendom the total discomfiture of the Gascon and Breton bands by Alberic Barbiano, the capture of St. Angelo, the flight of the Antipope, the submission of the Queen of Naples.²

Pope Urban and Queen Joanna were equally insincere: the Queen in her submission, the Pope Naples in his acceptance of it. Joanna had been the childless

cellor of Capua, his Nuncio in England. All other commissions were annulled. He was to collect "*omnes et singulos fructus, redditus et proventus beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum dicti regni vacantium, per nos seu Aplicâ auctoritate collatorum et conferendorum in antea, census quoque annuos, et alia omnia et singula res et bona nobis et cameræ prædictæ quâcunque ratione vel causâ debita.*" He specifies Peter's Pence. — MS., B. M., Aug. 27, 1379. The Archbishop of York is ordered to sequester all goods of adherents of Robert, "that son of iniquity." March 14, 1381. All sums, "*ratione communium servitorum*" (the ordinary phrase) on the translation of William (Courtenay), Bishop of London, to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, to be sent to Rome. Nov. 3, 1382.

¹ Curiales, Theodoric à Niem, i. 14.

² Apud Raynald. 1379, n. xxxi.

wife of four husbands ; the heir to the realm of Naples by both lines was Charles of Durazzo, nephew of the King of Hungary. The King of Hungary still cherished the deep purpose of revenge for the murder of his brother. Charles of Durazzo had been already invited during the hostilities of the Pope with Joanna not to wait the tardy succession, but to seize at once the crown of Naples.

All the passions least becoming a pontiff combined to influence Urban VI., policy, vengeance, family ambition, interest, pride ; policy, for he could not depend on the hollow friendship of Joanna ; vengeance, for without Joanna's aid and instigation the Cardinals at Fondi had not dared to elect the Antipope ; family ambition, for the nepotism of Urban, like that of his successors, was not content with benefices and cardinalates, it soared to principalities. One of his nephews, Francis Prignano, had been among the new Cardinals ; another, Buttillo Prignano, he aspired to invest in the principedom of Capua, Amalfi, and other wealthy fiefs. Interest and pride urged the advantage of a King of Naples, indebted to him for his crown, over whose power and treasures he might rule, as he afterwards endeavored to rule, with the almost undisputed despotism of a Protectorate.¹

Charles of Durazzo came to Rome ; he was invested by the Pope in the Sovereignty of Naples, as Charles of Durazzo. forfeited to its liege lord the Pontiff by the iniquities of Queen Joanna : he was crowned by the hand of the Pope.

¹ According to Gobelinus Persona, Urban had adherents in Naples. The parties met in strife in the streets: "Vivat Papa di Roma!" "Vivat Papa di Fundis!" — Apud Meibomium, i. p. 297.

Joanna was hardly less undisguised in her hostility to Pope Urban. In evil hour for herself, in worse for Naples, she determined to adopt as her heir Louis of Anjou, nephew of the King of France, thus again inflicting on her unhappy realm all the miseries of a French invasion. The French Pope hastened to invest the French Prince in the rights which, as Pope, he claimed with the same title as his rival in Rome.

Charles of Durazzo was first in the field. The unpopularity of Joanna with her subjects was heightened by their hatred of the French, and the long tradition of their tyranny. The churchmen were for Pope Urban; their inclination had been skilfully increased by the distribution of benefices and dignities. The Hungarian and Papal forces met scarcely any resistance. Treacherous Naples opened its gates. Otho July 16.

of Brunswick, the husband of Joanna, hastily summoned from Germany, was betrayed by his own bravery into the power of his enemies: Joanna was besieged in the Castel-Nuovo. She looked in Aug. 25.

vain for the Provençal fleets and the French armament. Famine compelled her to capitulate; she was sent prisoner to a castle in the Basilicata. The inexorable King of Hungary demanded the death of the murderess, though acquitted of the crime by one Pope, and in close alliance with successive Popes. Pope Urban was silent; the unhappy daughter of a line of kings was put to death, either strangled while at her May 22, 1382. prayers,¹ or smothered, according to another account, under a pillow of feathers. Thus died Joanna II. of

¹ A Niem says: "Cum quâdam die oraret, *ut fertur*, sedens ante altare genu flexo, de mandato ipsius Caroli, per quatuor satellites Hungaros fuerat strangulata."

Naples, leaving her fame an historic problem. To some she was a monster of lust and cruelty, the assassin of her husband; to others a wise, even a most religious princess, who governed her kingdom during peace with firm and impartial rule, promulgated excellent laws, established the most equitable tribunals. Her repeated marriages were only from the patriotic desire of bearing an heir to the throne of her fathers.¹

Louis of Anjou, in the meantime, had been crowned King of Naples by Clement VII. But Clement, prodigal of all which might embarrass the hostile Pope, not only as liege lord granted away Naples, he created for his French ally a new kingdom, that of Adria. It comprised all the Papal territories, the March of Ancona, Romagna, the Duchy of Spoleto, Massa Trabaria, the cities of Bologna, Ferrara, Ravenna, Perugia, Todi, the whole region except the City of Rome, with her domain, the Patrimony of St. Peter in Tuscany, the Maritima, and Sabina. These were reserved for the Pope and his successors.²

The Provençal fleet of Louis (Provence received him at once as her lord) was too late to rescue the Queen. His powerful land army encountered no resistance till it reached the frontiers of the kingdom.³ Among the followers of Louis was Robert, Count of Geneva, the brother of Pope Clement. Many of the highest Neapolitan nobles, the great Constable Thomas di San Severino, the Tricarici, the Counts of Conversano, Caserta, St. Agata, Altanella, fell off from Charles, and joined the invading ranks. Louis had passed Ben-

¹ Compare Giannone on the character of Joanna.

² Leibnitz, *Cod. fur. Genl.* i. 206, quoted by Muratori, *Ann.*, sub ann. 1382.

³ The army of Louis is stated at 40,000, 45,000, even 60,000 men. — Note of Mansi, in Raynald., A. D. 1382.

evento and occupied Caserta; Charles stood on the defensive.

The embarrassment of Charles was increased by tidings that the Pope was marching towards A.D. 1888.

Naples: ¹ he mistrusted his friend almost as much as his enemy. He hastened to meet Urban at Capua, from thence, by Aversa,² conducted him to Naples, under the cover of anxiety for his personal safety. He would not permit the Pope to take up his residence in the archiepiscopal palace; he escorted him, under a strong guard of honor, to the Castel-Nuovo. Nov. 1888.

Charles had eluded the condition of his elevation to the throne, the erection of the principality of Capua for Butillo, the Pope's nephew. Urban seized the opportunity of his distress to demand, not only Capua, with its adjacent towns, Cagnazzo and Carata, but also the Duchy of Amalfi, Nocera, and other towns and castles. On these terms, and these alone, the Pope would aid the King against the invading French, and grant the plenary dominion over the rest of the realm. Charles was compelled to yield; the compact was celebrated with great rejoicings; the Pope was permitted to occupy the archiepiscopal palace; the marriage of two of his nieces with two Neapolitan nobles was celebrated with high festivity. In the midst was a tumult in the city. The Pope's nephew had broken into a Butillo the Pope's nephew. convent and ravished a nun of high birth.

¹ Urban set out in May to Tivoli; then to a small castle, Vellemonite, in Campania. He was at Ferentino in Sept. till Michaelmas Day.

² At Aversa à Niem (then with Urban) was in a great fright "quod aliquid sinistrum contra nos dispositum esset, quia sicut in sacco tenebamur inclusi." Compare Gobelinus Persona, apud Meibomium. By his account, Charles was compelled to use much courteous force to bring Urban to Naples.

and celebrated beauty. Loud complaints were made to the Pope; he laughed it off as a venial outburst of youth: his nephew Butillo was forty years old. But the King's justice would not or dared not endure the crime. A capital sentence was passed against Butillo. The Pope, as Suzerain of the realm, annulled the sentence of the King's Justiciary and of the King. After some contest Butillo was, if not rewarded, bought off from the indulgence of his lusts, by a wife, the daughter of the Justiciary, and of the King's kindred, with a dowry of 70,000 florins a year,¹ and the noble castle of Nocera.

Spiritual censures were reserved for offenders of another kind. The Pope celebrated high mass, and declared Louis, Count of Anjou, heretic, excommunicated, accursed, published a crusade against him, and offered plenary indulgence to all who should take up arms. Charles of Durazzo was proclaimed Gonfalonier of the Church.² During all this time there was a violent persecution of all the Neapolitan clergy, as before of the Sicilian, suspected of inclinations to the Antipope. The Cardinal di Sangro was the chief agent to the Pope in these measures of destitution, confiscation, and torture. The basest of the clergy were substituted for the ejected Prelates or Abbots.³

¹ All this from Theodoric à Niem, then in the Pope's retinue.

² MS., B. M. There is a commission appointing John, Duke of Lancaster, Gonfalonier of the Church in the crusade against John, calling himself King of Castile and Leon. March 21, 1383. Privileges are granted to all crusaders against Robert, Antipope, and the King of Castile. About the same time Thomas, Archbishop of York, who owed 2000 florins under the title "communium servitiorum," is called on to pay. Aug. 6, 1383.

³ "De Sangro credidit sacrificium offerre se Deo, sic omnes ipsos miseros perturbando . . . adeo miser et iners Neapolitanorum clericus eâ vice vix reperiebatur, qui non fieret Archiepiscopus vel Episcopus aut Abbas vel

Charles protracted the war with skill ; it is difficult to account for the inactivity of the French. Charles was suddenly relieved by the death ^{Death of Louis of Anjou.} of his enemy. Louis of Anjou died at Bariglio. The French army, already wasted by the plague of which Amadeo, Duke of Savoy, perhaps Louis of Anjou himself, had died,¹ broke up, and retired beyond the Alps.

Charles had now no open adversary. He had still eluded the surrender of the great city of Cap- ^{Oct. 10, 1384.} ua to the Pope's nephew. He had ceded Nocera, and in that fortress the Pope and some of his Cardinals had taken up their dwelling. The ^{Quarrel of Charles and Pope Urban. May, 1384.} Cardinals had once fled, but were recalled. Amidst the rejoicings of the capital Charles summoned the Pope to meet him to deliberate on important affairs. "Kings have been wont to wait on Popes, not Popes on Kings," was the mistrustful and haughty reply of the Pope. He added, to ingratiate himself with the people, "If Charles would have me for his friend, let him repeal the taxes imposed on his kingdom." Charles sent back for answer, "that if he came he would come like a king, at the head of his army ; he wondered that priests should presume to interfere with his kingdom — his by force of ^{Nov. 1384.} arms, and as the inheritance of his wife : to the Pope he owed but the four words in the investiture." "The kingdom," rejoined Urban, "belongs to the Church — a fief granted to a king who shall rule with modera-

Prælati per eundem Urbanum. dummodo talis vellet esse." — Theod. à Niem, i. c. xxvi. Compare, on the persecutions, Vit. I. Clement, p. 502.

¹ The plague may have been the cause of the previous inactivity. Charles himself had the plague, but recovered.

tion, not flay his subjects to the quick : the Church may resume her gift, and grant it to a more loyal liegeman." Charles made no further answer. Alberic Barbiano, the Constable of the kingdom, with a strong force, laid siege to Nocera. But this old strong-
Feb. 1285. hold of the last Mohammedans in the kingdom defied the insufficient engines and battering trains of the times. Daily might the old Pope be seen on the walls, with lighted torches, and with bells sounding, pronouncing his malediction against the besiegers.¹

Some of the Cardinals whom Urban had created, and who had followed him, though reluctantly, to Naples (many of them were with him still more reluctantly in Nocera),² endeavored to soften the furious Pope, and to induce him not to provoke too far the victorious Hungarian, now elated with success. They urged him at least to return to Rome. Urban suspected treachery. No doubt some secret consultations were held about his conduct. Bartolino of Piacenza, a bold, shrewd, unscrupulous lawyer, had framed answers to twelve questions, abstract in their form, but significant enough in their intent.³ "Whether, if the Pope were notoriously negligent or incompetent, or so headstrong and obstinate as to endanger the whole Church — if he should act entirely according to his arbitrary will in contempt of the Council of the Cardinals — it might be lawful for the Cardinals to appoint one or more

¹ Urban at least gave ground for the suspicion that he contemplated the resumption of the kingdom, the deposal of Charles. Did his extravagant nepotism look even higher than the principedom of Capua?

² In Ferentino he had threatened to deprive some. — A Niem, xxviii.

³ Theodoric à Niem had seen the questions, with the opinions of some learned theologians.

guardians, according to whose advice he would be bound to regulate his actions." One of the Cardinals, an Orsini by birth, betrayed the secret to the Pope, and declared certain of his brethren privy to the agitation of these perilous questions. The Pope inveigled such as were not there, to Nocera, as though to hold a consistory. Six of them, the most learned and of best repute, were seized and cast into ^{Arrest of Cardinals.} a close and fetid dungeon, an old tank or cistern. Of the names given are the Cardinal di Sangro, John, Archbishop of Corfu (C. St. Sabina), Ludovico Donati, Archbishop of Tarento (St. Marco), Adam, Bishop of London (C. St. Cecilia), Eleazar, Bishop of Reate.¹ There Theodoric à Niem (whose relation is extant), appointed with other of the Pope's ministers to take their examination, found them in the most pitiable state. The Cardinal di Sangro, a tall and corpulent man, had not room to stretch out his feet. They were loaded with chains. The Pope's ministers questioned them, adjured them in vain to confession. The inquisitors returned to the Pope; two of them burst into tears. Urban sternly taunted their womanish weakness. Theodoric, by his own account, ventured to urge the Pope to mercy.² Urban became only more furious; his face reddened like a lamp; his voice was choked with passion. He produced a confession, wrung forth the day before by torture from the Bishop of Aquila, which inculpated the Cardinals. The conspiracy, indeed, with which they were charged by the suspicion of Urban, or by their enemies who had gained the ear of Urban, was terrible enough. They had determined to seize the Pope, to declare him a heretic, and to burn

¹ Compare Baluzius, ii. 985.² Theodoric à Niem.

him.¹ They were brought before the public consistory; if they had confessed, it was believed that they would have been made over to the executioner and the stake. They persisted in their denial; they were thrust back into their noisome dungeon, to suffer from hunger, thirst, cold, and reptiles.

Three days after the Cardinals were submitted to the torture: that of two is described with horrible minuteness by the unwilling witness. The Cardinal di Sangro was stripped almost naked, and hoisted by the pulley. Buttillo, the Pope's nephew, stood laughing at his agonies. Thrice he was hoisted. Theodoric, unable to endure the sight, entreated him to make some confession. The Cardinal bitterly reproached himself with the tortures which he himself had inflicted on archbishops, bishops, and abbots, the partisans of the Antipope, for the cause of Urban. The executioner was a fierce ruffian, who had been a pirate, and was now Prior of the Hospitallers. The Cardinal of Venice, an old, feeble, and infirm man, had not to suffer the same bitter self-reproach as Di Sangro: yet he was racked with even worse cruelty from morning to dinner-time. He only uttered, "Christ has suffered for us." The Pope was heard below in

¹ "Tanquam hæreticus condemnaretur puniendus . . . et statim sententiâ per ipsos Cardinales tanquam per Collegium sic latâ, executio ejusdem per ignem fieret ibidem." — A Niem. Gobelinus (of Benevento), a contemporary, apud Meibomium, i. 301, says: "Prout postea quibusdam officialibus Papæ revelatum est unde ad me notitia hujus facti devenit, quia de familiâ Cameræ Apostolicæ tunc extiti." This version of the affair is even worse for the character of Urban. His harshness and pride had driven above half the Cardinals to invite an Antipope; now the same harshness and pride, with nepotism, had driven five more Cardinals to conspire to seize the Pope and burn him as a heretic. Gobelinus confirms the torture: he speaks of the nephew as Prince of Capua, who seized the Cardinals.

the garden, reciting aloud his breviary, that the executioner might be encouraged by his presence.¹

Urban was besieged in Nocera; among his fiercest enemies was the Abbot of Monte Casino;² but he had still active partisans in Italy. The Pope was the head of a great interest. Raimondello Orsini made a bold diversion in his favor. A Genoese fleet hovered on the coast. Pope Urban made a sudden sally from Nocera, aided by some troops raised by San-severino and the Orsini, reached first friendly ^{Escape of the Pope to Genoa.}

Benevento, then got on board the galleys between Barletta and Trani. He dragged with him the wretched Cardinals. During the flight to the galleys, the Bishop of Aquila, enfeebled by torture, could not keep his sorry horse to his speed. Urban, suspecting that he sought to escape, in his fury ordered him to be killed; his body was left unburied on the road. With the rest he started across to Sicily; thence to Genoa. The Cardinals, if they reached Genoa alive, survived not long. By some accounts they were tied in A.D. 1386. sacks and cast into the sea, or secretly despatched in their prisons.³ One only, the Englishman, was

¹ "Idemque Urbanus interim in horto inferius ambulabat, altè legendo officium, ita quod eum legentem nos in aulâ audiebamus, volens dictum Basilium per hoc reddere sollicitum quod mandatum de diligenter torquendo Cardinalem non negligeret." — A Niem, c. lii. p. 44.

² They were horrible times. Peter Tartarus, the Abbot of Monte Casino, watched all the outlets from Nocera, seized and put to the torture the partisans of the Pope. "Eos idem Abbas variis tormentis affecit." — Gobelinus, p. 303. A messenger with secret letters to the Pope was taken and slung like a stone from the machines into the castle; he was dashed to pieces. Gobelinus describes the siege at length. He was then at Benevento: he saw a placard offering indulgences to all who would succor the Pope, the same as for a crusade to the Holy Land. See also the flight in Gobelinus, who was in the Pope's train.

³ Muratori, sub ann. 1385. A Niem says, "Utique ipsi quinque Cardi-

spared: it was said, out of respect for, or at the intervention of, King Richard II. Nocera fell; the Pope's nephew, Butillo, was the prisoner of King Charles.

Urban remained in Genoa almost alone. Some of his Cardinals had perished under his hand; others, Pileus Cardinal of Ravenna, Galeotto of Pietra Mala, fled, after a vain effort to save the lives of their colleagues. They might indeed dread the wrath of the Pontiff: they too had written letters to the Roman clergy, on the means of coercing the proud and cruel Pope, whom they not obscurely declared to be mad, though his madness excused not his horrible wickedness.¹ But Genoa would not endure the barbarous inhumanities of the Pope; not only did the inhabitants treat him with cold disrespect, the magistrates seized and punished some of the satellites of his cruelties: the indignant Pope left the city and proceeded to Lucca.² Before this he had shown some disposition to forgive, not indeed, his own enemies. Gian Galeazzo Visconti had surprised his uncle Bernabo by the basest treachery, and poisoned him. Gian

nales postea non videbantur." There was a report that their bodies were thrown into a pit in a stable and consumed with quicklime. Gobelius (who wrote a poem in praise of Urban) says, "*Quinque Cardinales quos usque tunc in carceribus detinuit ibidem mortuos reliquit, sed quomodo aut quali modo vitam finierint, non planè mihi constat.*" Eleven years after he heard that they had been murdered in prison, and buried in a stable. P. 310.

¹ *Literæ apud Baluzium, ii. No. 226.* "*Ut videbatur insano similis et furenti. . . Multasque iniquitates et detestabilia scelera commisit et cotidie committit.*" They allege the imprisonment, torture, starvation of the Cardinals at Nocera.

² Walsingham asserts that Urban did not get away from Genoa "*donec inestimabilem auri summam pro suâ ereptione persolvisset januensibus, qui plus propter nummum quam propter Deum ejus ereptioni præstenderant, sicut patet.*" — P. 320.

Galeazzo had no difficulty (his power and wealth were boundless) in obtaining absolution.¹

The wounded pride of Urban was not the sole motive for his journey to Lucca. Charles, King of Naples, now his deadly foe, had gone to Hungary to claim the crown of that realm. There he had been murdered. His enemies refused him burial, as under excommunication.² The Pope remorseless as ever warred against the unburied body, against his widow and his orphans. Queen Margaret and her blameless children were loaded with malediction. Margaret claimed the crown of Naples for her son Ladislaus; the Angevin party for the son of Louis of Anjou. The Pope maintained a haughty and mysterious silence as to their conflicting pretensions.³ He levied troops; he set himself at their head in Perugia. No one could penetrate his design. It was surmised that he aspired to assume the kingdom himself as Pope, or to raise his nephew to the throne. He issued a furious manifesto to the whole of Christendom, calling on all clerks and laymen to take up arms and join the Papal forces against the Antichrist the Pope of Avignon, alleging the example of the Levites who slew in one day 23,000 idolaters without regard to kindred or consanguinity, and against the contumacious kingdom of Naples.⁴ Of the rights of Ladislaus not one

¹ A Niem, c. lvi.

² Mailath, Geschichte der Magyaren, ii. 110.

³ "Dimorava intanto Papa Urbino in Lucca, mirando con dispetto le rivoluzioni di Napoli, tutte contrarie a suoi interessi." — Muratori, Ann. sub ann.

⁴ This manifesto is dated Lucca, Aug. 29, 1387. It contains this extraordinary passage about the Virgin Mary (the army was to assemble on the

word, though Queen Margaret had attempted to propitiate him, by sending his nephew, a prisoner since the capture of Nocera by King Charles, to Genoa.

This nephew, Butillo, was at once the madness, the constant disgrace, danger, and distress of the weak, imperious, unforgiving Pontiff. At Perugia the rufian stole into the house of a noble lady, for whom he had a violent passion; he was waylaid by her brothers, and well scourged. The Pope withdrew from the insolent city, but he did not suspend his martial preparations. He had determined to provide for his financial wants, and to confirm his waning popularity with the burghers of Rome, by a Jubilee, of which he himself might reap the immediate fruits. The period of this great festival had been contracted by Clement VI. to fifty years. An ingenious calculation discovered, that if the time of the Saviour's life were reckoned thirty-three years, the Jubilee would fall during the year next ensuing.¹ This holy pretext was eagerly seized; Christendom was summoned to avail itself of the incalculable blessings of a pilgrimage to Rome, with all the benefits of indulgences. The treasury of the Holy See was prepared to receive the tribute of the world.

But Urban sowed for another to reap.² A fall from Aug. 1388. his mule shook the enfeebled frame of the Pontiff. He could not return to Perugia, distant about ten miles: he was carried in a litter to Ferentino, on his way to the kingdom of Naples. At the

Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin): "*Quæ est impiis terribilis, velut castrorum acies ordinata, et cunctas hæreses sola interemit in toto mundo.*" — Apud Raynald. 1387, No. 6.

¹ Gobelius, p. 310.

² The words of Theodoric à Niem.

approach of winter he was compelled, by the failure of funds for the payment of his soldiers, to return to Rome. He was coldly received.¹ He lingered for a year, giving directions to regulate and eagerly awaiting the coming Jubilee, which he never saw. He died in the autumn.

Death of
Urban VI.
Oct. 15, 1389.

Charity might almost admit for the manners and the acts of this Pontiff the excuse of insanity (some of the Cardinals manifestly entertained this belief); but whether more than the insanity of ungoverned passions, pride, ambition, cruelty, and blind nepotism, must be left to wiser judgment than that of man.²

Clement VII. reigned at Avignon in comparative peace and dignity. The fiercer parts of his character, which had been so darkly shown during his wars as Legate, at the massacre of Cesena, in which perished 30,000 human beings, were no longer called into action. His war against his adversary was waged by the more innocuous arms of encountering ecclesiastical censures, and by the investiture of Louis of Anjou in the kingdom of Naples. The clergy in all the great kingdoms followed or led their rulers. No doubt there were partisans of Clement in the realms which espoused the cause of Urban — of Urban in those which sided with Clement. Schism, when it was a stern acknowledged duty to hate, punish, exterminate schismatics, could not but produce persecution and victims of perse-

¹ Gobelinus adorns his return to Rome with miracles, and says, "Romam cum honore magno regressus est."

² "Hic obiit Romæ et dicitur quod fuerit intoxicatus propter nimiam suam duritiam." — Chron. Ratisbon. Eccard, i. 2118. Walsingham sums up the character of Urban VI.: "Rigidus erat sibi, sed suis multò rigidior, ita ut delinquentibus nunquam ignosceret, aut eorum ærumnis aliquatenus compateretur: probat hæc pœna suorum Cardinalium ferociter inflicta et æterna damnatio carceris subsecuta." — P. 346.

cution. Everywhere might be found divisions, spoliations, even bloodshed; ejected and usurping clergy, dispossessed and intrusive abbots and bishops; feuds, battles for churches and monasteries. Among all other causes of discord, arose this the most discordant; to the demoralizing and unchristianizing tendencies of the times was added a question on which the best might differ, which to the bad would be an excuse for every act of violence, fraud, or rapacity. Clement and his Cardinals are charged with great atrocities against the adherents of Urban.¹ The Italian partisans of Clement, who escaped the cruelty of Urban, crowded to the court of Clement; but that court, at first extremely poor, gave but cold entertainment to these faithful strangers: they had to suffer the martyrdom of want for their loyalty. When this became known, others suppressed their opinions, showed outward obedience to the dominant power, and so preserved their benefices.² France at times bitterly lamented her indulgence of her pride and extravagance, in adhering to her separate Pontiff. If France would have her own Pope, she must be at the expense of maintaining that Pope and his Conclave. While the Transalpine kingdoms in the obedience of Urban rendered but barren allegiance, paid no tenths to the Papal See, took quiet possession of the appointment to vacant benefices; in France the liberties of the Church were perpetually invaded. The clergy were crushed with demands of tenths or subsidies; their estates were

¹ "Multum enim atrociter contra obediētes dicto Urbano prefatus Clemens et sui Cardinales ac eorum complices, in principio dicti schismatis, se habuerunt." — See the rest of the passage, Theodoric à Niem, i. xix.

² Vit. Clement. p. 497. Evils of the Schism, *ibid.* Compare with à Niem.

loaded with debts to enrich the Apostolic Chamber. The six-and-thirty Cardinals had proctors in ambush in all parts of the realm, armed with Papal Bulls, to give notice if any large benefice fell vacant in cathedral or collegiate churches, or the priories of wealthy abbeys. They were immediately grasped as Papal reserves, to reward or to secure the fidelity of the hungry Cardinals.¹ They handed these down in succession to each other, sometimes condescending to disguise the accumulation of pluralities by only charging the benefices with large payments to themselves. "So," says an ecclesiastic of the day, "the generous intentions of kings and royal families were frustrated, the service of God was neglected, the devotion of the faithful grew cold, the realm was drained; many ecclesiastics were in the lowest state of penury; the flourishing schools of the realm were reduced to nothing; the University of Paris mourned for want of scholars."² Clement had the satisfaction of receiving some important partisans, who were alienated by the rude manners or repulsive acts of Urban. The two surviving Italian Cardinals of the old Conclave, Milan and Florence, joined him early. The Cardinal of Prato and the Cardinal of Pietra Mala³ had revolted from Urban at Genoa. Di Prato publicly burned his red hat, and received another from Clement. But on the accession of Boniface IX. he fell back again to the

¹ Compare the Monk of St. Denys: "*Omnes ecclesiasticas dignitates quascunque, post episcopalem, majores indifferenter suæ dispositioni reservavit.*" — P. 82. See also p. 398, and the regulations adopted by the King, at the instance of the University of Paris, to check the Papal exactions.

² Relig. S. Denys, ut supra. Documents Inédits.

³ Ciacconius, p. 637.

Italian Pontiff: he was called in derision the triple-hatted.¹ The kingdoms of Spain, after an ostentatiously laborious examination of the titles of the two Pontiffs, were won, by the dexterous diplomacy of the Cardinal of Luna, to Clement. Clement was generous, affable, accomplished, perhaps with more of the French noble than the Pope. He was splendid and liberal, and therefore could not be too scrupulous as to the sources of his revenue. The creation of Cardinals was chiefly in the French interest, as those of his predecessors, to perpetuate the see at Avignon, though he did not lose sight of the advantage of maintaining some Italian supporters. His nepotism tempted him not to the daring courses of Urban; his kindred were content with ecclesiastical dignities or Church estates, which Clement did not hesitate to alienate to the lay nobility. By the death of his brother, Clement became Count of Geneva, but in him expired the line. He survived his rival Urban VI. about five years.²

¹ The indignant biographer of Clement charitably wishes him a fourth of red-hot brass or steel. — Apud Baluz. p. 524.

² He died Sept. 16, 1394. See on his death next chapter.

CHAPTER III.

BONIFACE IX. BENEDICT XIII.

THE Avignonese Pontiff, Clement VII., and his Cardinals had some vague hope that on the death of Urban Christendom would recognize his claims. These hopes were speedily dissipated. The Italian Cardinals proceeded at once to the election of Peter Tomacelli, a Neapolitan.¹ He took the name of Bon- Boniface IX. iface IX. Would he be the worthy successor of the last true Italian Pope, Boniface VIII.? He was a man of ability;² though by one account not above thirty years old, he had mastered the passions of youth. After the turbulent and restless reign of Urban, that of Boniface might seem to promise at least comparative repose. The charge against his fame is insatiable avarice, flagrant and shameless simony. But Boniface was pressed with more than common necessi- State of Italy. ties.³ The schism imposed upon Christendom the maintenance of two Papal Courts; the more peaceful

¹ On this election the Monk of St. Denys observes: "*Infidelibus quoque sancta religio et Catholica fides habebatur ludibrio, dum Bonifacius Romæ, Clemens vero Avinione sibi Apostolicam auctoritatem vindicabant.*" — xi. 9. p. 692.

² He was not skilled in chanting or in writing, not eminently instructed in any science but grammar, fluent in speech. Theodoric à Niem, one of his secretaries, had a contemptuous opinion of his capacity for business.

³ "Per lo Papa manteneva lo stato suo con molta pace, e dovizia." — *Infessura*, apud Muratori, p. 1175.

magnificence of Avignon ; that of Rome less secure, involved in almost inevitable wars, and in the perplexed politics of Italy. The ordinary revenues of the Roman Pontiff were cut off. France, once the wealthiest and most prodigal of the kingdoms, and Spain, acknowledged the Antipope. In England the King and the Parliament had become extremely jealous of the wealth of their own Clergy, still more of the subsidies levied by Rome. The statutes of the realm began to speak a defiant and economic language ; that of Provisors under Edward III., the fuller statute of Mortmain under Richard II., showed a determination to set a limit to the boundless exactions of the hierarchy. The Clergy were not unwilling to restrict the tribute paid to the Papal Chamber. The progress of Wycliffite opinions strengthened the reluctance of the people. The Pope was reduced to implore a charitable subsidy of the Archbishop and Clergy ;¹ and could not but betray how he writhed under the stern restrictions of the statutes of Provisors, and the refusal to permit the revenues of English benefices to enrich the Cardinals of Rome.² The northern kingdoms, as well as Poland

¹ MS., B. M. He writes to the Archbishop of Canterbury to obtain "certum caritativum subsidium." — Jan. 2, 1390.

² See the very curious document, MS., B. M., in which Boniface rehearses at length all the main articles of the three Statutes of Provisors passed by Edward III. and Richard: his utter amazement that the last came from such a Catholic King, one so zealous for the orthodox faith (with almost a page of laudatory titles). "The King ought to have seen, what is clearer than noonday, that laymen can have no right to dispose of ecclesiastical things." He pronounces all the statutes "cassa et irrita." Feb. 4, 1391. He writes of the great Council of the realm, "Quia nonnulli avaro cupiditatis vicio." Certain persons had intruded into benefices held in York by Adam, Cardinal of St. Cecilia. He urges redress to the Cardinal. March 15, 1391. A month after he makes a pathetic appeal to the whole clergy of England for a subvention. They coldly refused it. April 14, 1391. We

and Hungary, were poor. Germany had to maintain her own splendid and princely Prelates, and those Prelates to keep up their own state. In Italy the Patrimony of St. Peter had been invaded by the Duke of Milan, Gian Galeazzo Visconti, who seemed to aspire to the kingdom of Italy. On his death the Duke bequeathed to his sons, among his territories, Bologna, Perugia, Sienna. Even in the immediate domain of the See most of the towns and cities were in the power of petty independent tyrants or of the old nobles. Naples was distracted by civil war. The sons of Charles of Durazzo and Louis of Anjou were fighting for the throne.

At the same time there were imperious demands on the Papal exchequer. The Pope could not stand aloof from the affairs of Naples. The nepotism of Boniface was more humble than the audacious family ambition of Urban. He espoused at once the cause of Ladislaus. Queen Margaret was relieved from ecclesiastical censures, and the house of Hungary declared the rightful heirs. But the award of the Holy See must be enforced; aid in money and in troops must be afforded to expel the French usurper, whose title was his grant from the Pope of Avignon. In Rome, where at first Boniface took up his abode, all was ruin. The churches were in miserable dilapidation; the Capitol was falling; the Castle of St. Angelo had been almost razed to the ground. The Jubilee of 1390, to which pilgrims came from Germany, England, Poland, Hungary, enriched the Papal coffers for a time. Boniface raised 600 horse under Alberic Barbiano, in aid of Naples. He ordered extensive repairs in the churches. The treasures in

have one account of his modest receipts, amounting to but 1515 florins, reckoned equal to 252*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

hand were soon exhausted. The one resource of the Papal Chamber was the wealth of the Clergy, and that wealth could hardly be reached by direct taxation. The Pope was reduced to that which was branded by the odious name of Simony, and, as the system was organized by Boniface IX., was Simony in its worst form. At first, and even for seven years of his Pontificate, Boniface stood in some awe of the more rigid Cardinals. He did not publicly take money for the higher promotions; he took it only in secret, and through trustworthy agents; but he had always reasons to allege to the Cardinals against the advancement of those who were unable or refused to pay. As these Cardinals to his joy dropped off, he gave free rein to his cupidity.¹ At length, after ten years, at once to indulge, palliate, and to establish this simony, he substituted as a permanent tax the Annates, or First-fruits of every bishopric and rich abbey, calculated on a new scale, triple that in which they stood before in the Papal books.² This was to be paid in advance by the candidates for promotion, some of whom never got possession of the benefice. That was matter of supreme indifference to Boniface, as he could sell it again. But as these candidates rarely came to the court with money equal to the demand, usurers, with whom the Pope was in unholy league, advanced the sum on exorbitant interest. The debt was sometimes sued for in the Pope's court.

¹ By a regulation in his Chancery of the seventh year of his Papacy, the Archbishop, Bishop, or Abbot who did not exhibit letters from the Pope himself in the Papal Exchequer, and had not fully discharged all the claims upon him, forfeited his preferment.

² Mansi has proved against Raynaldus, that Boniface, if not the inventor of the annates, first made them a perpetual burden. — Note on Raynald. sub ann.

The smaller benefices were sold from the day of his appointment with shameless and scandalous notoriety. Men wandered about Lombardy and other parts of Italy, searching out the age of hoary incumbents, and watching their diseases and infirmities. For this service they were well paid by the greedy aspirants at Rome. On their report the tariff rose or fell. Benefices were sold over and over again. Graces were granted to the last purchaser, with the magic word "Preference,"¹ which cost twenty-five florins. That was superseded by a more authoritative phrase (at fifty florins), a prerogative of precedence.² Petitions already granted were sometimes cancelled in favor of a higher bidder: the Pope treated the lower offer as an attempt to defraud him. In the same year the secretary Theodoric à Niem had known the same benefice sold in the course of one week to several successive claimants. The benefices were so openly sold that if money was not at hand the Pope would receive the price in kind, in swine, sheep, oxen, horses, or grain. The officers were as skilful in these arts as himself. His auditors would hold twenty expectatives, and receive the first-fruits. The Argus-eyed Pope, however, watched the death-bed of all his officers. Their books, robes, furniture, money, escheated to the Pope. No grace of any kind, even to the poorest, was signed without its florin fee. The Pope, even during Mass, was seen to be consulting with his secretaries on these worldly affairs.³ The accumulation of pluralities on unworthy men was scandalous even in those times.⁴

¹ Anteferre.

² Prærogativa antelationis.

³ Compare à Niem, ii. c. 7 to 12.

⁴ "Vidi etiam tunc unius auditorum causarum dicti Bonifacii hominis

The rapacity of Boniface was more odious from the unpopularity of his mother and his brothers ; the mother the most avaricious of women, his brothers and their sons, in whose favor the nepotism of Boniface, in general sordid, yet in one instance was ostentatiously prodigal. He bought the principality of Sora for one of them at an enormous price from Ladislaus of Naples.

Boniface, on his accession, had proclaimed to Christendom his earnest anxiety to extinguish the schism. The means he proposed were not well chosen to promote the end. He addressed Clement VII. as the son of Belial. "Some perverse men, trusting in the arm of flesh against the Lord, cry out for a Council. O damned and damnable impiety!"¹ Two years after he sent a milder letter by two Carthusian monks. They were imprisoned by Clement, and only released on the intervention of the King of France.

The death of Clement VII. might seem a providential summons to close the schism. The University of Paris, now the first learned body

Sept. 16,
1394.

inutilis et solo nomine Decretorum Doctoris literas super expectativâ gratiâ in diversis provinciis Germaniæ fabricatas, in quibus dispensabatur inter alia secum, quod sex incompatibilia beneficia recipere et simul retinere, illaque totiens, quotiens sibi placeret, simpliciter vel ex causâ pronuntiationis dimittere et loco dimissorum totidem similia et dissimilia beneficia recipere et retinere posset etiam si essent dignitates majores post Pontificales," &c., &c. — A Niem, ii. xi. Compare Gobelinus, who is almost as strong on the abuses of the Papal Chancery under Boniface IX. as A Niem, pp. 316, 318.

¹ "Sed dicunt impii perversiores, in carnali brachio contra potentiam Domini confidentes, fiat Concilium, ut schisma sedetur. O damnosa, et damnanda impietas!" He accuses the Cardinals of having gained the consent of the King of France to the creation of Clement, by accusing Urban VI. of a design to deprive him of his kingdom. It was the aim of the King of France to unite the French and Papal crowns. — Apud D'Achery, vol. i. p. 770. The Monk of St. Denys gives this letter, l. xiii. 14. The second, xiv. 12.

in Christendom, had already taken the lead, denouncing the diabolical schism.¹ They had urged the King to take the affairs into his own hands, and to compel the conflicting Popes to accede to one of three schemes for the termination of the contest — Cession, Arbitration, or a General Council. Clement had received this memorial in a fury of passion: he denounced it as an insolent and defamatory libel. “Dost thou understand this Latin?” he said to the bearer. “Sufficiently!” the officer replied; but when the Pope withdrew into his chamber in much manifest wrath he thought it prudent to leave Avignon. The Pope would see no one, speak to no one. The Cardinals met and agreed to press on the Pope the measures proposed by the university. He assembled them, and bitterly reproached them with their traitorous cowardice. They replied by urging calmly ^{Sept. 18, 1504.} the necessity of the measure. Clement retired and never more left his chamber. Three days after he was struck with apoplexy: his death was attrib- ^{Oct. 18, 1504.} uted to his grief.² So soon as his death was known the University wrote again to the King, adjuring him to prohibit the Cardinals at Avignon from proceeding

¹ See for the proceedings of the University, during the lifetime of Clement, the Monk of St. Denys, xiv. 10. Read too (in the Gersoniana) the address of the University to the King — Quare hoc? They ask of the consequences of the schism. Because unworthy men are promoted to the highest rank in the Church. “Quibus nihil sancti est, nihil pensi nihil honesti curæ sit; exhauriunt ecclesias, religiones dissipant, monasteria spoliant.” The churches are in ruins; the lower priesthood oppressed, reduced to mendicancy; the treasures of the churches sold. “Exactiones gravissimas, maximas, intolerabiles pauperibus Ecclesiæ ministris imponunt, impiissimos homines, atque inhumanissimos ad colligendum eligunt,” &c., &c.

² Rel. de St. Denys, xv. v.

to a new election.¹ The wary Cardinals, lest they should seem to despise the King's counsel, hurried over the election, and then opened the royal letter. The Cardinals swore to do all in their power to end the Schism now they had put it out of their power. No act could be more certain to perpetuate it than the election of the Spaniard, the crafty, able, ambitious, unprincipled Cardinal of Luna. Before the election their solemn oath had been taken to each other that whoever was chosen should at once resign the Papacy at the requisition of the Cardinals, if Boniface would likewise resign. The Cardinal of Luna had been the loudest to condemn the Schism; he had openly and repeatedly declared that if he were Pope he would put an end to it at once.

Benedict XIII. (such was his title) communicated his election to the King of France. "The Benedict XIII. Oct. 28. importunity of the Cardinals had compelled him to accept the unwelcome office, but he was prepared by all means which should be advisable to promote the union of the Church."² The University sent an address, eloquent and almost adulatory; it was received with the most gracious urbanity. "I am as ready to resign the office as to take off this cap." He took it off and saluted them. Each of the Popes was fully prepared to heal the Schism provided he himself remained Pope; but neither could show such disrespect to the Cardinals to whom he owed his elevation as to invalidate their privilege of election: neither would acknowledge himself an intrusive and usurping Pontiff.

¹ There are 24 names of Cardinals in Ciacconius.

² Dupuy, *Hist. du Schisme*, p. 89.

In Italy Boniface IX., notwithstanding his rapacity (perhaps through his rapacity, which extorted Boniface IX. ecclesiastical wealth for the secular purposes of his government), by ability, moderation, and firmness, had made some progress towards the reinstatement of the Papacy in respect and authority.¹ That respect it had almost lost, when the Roman dominions of the Pope were treated as the province of a foreign prelate, oppressed rather than governed by a Cardinal Legate: that authority the fierce and desultory ambition of Urban VI. had shaken rather than confirmed. The noble city of Perugia was weary of her factions, Guelf and Ghibelline. The Beccarini (the nobles and their partisans), the Raspanti (the burghers with their adherents) offered to receive the Pope as a resident and as sovereign within their walls. Boniface knew that nothing promoted the popularity of the Pope in Rome so much as his absence. No sooner had the Romans lost the Pope than they were eager for his return. He moved to Perugia. Ancona and some of the other cities made advances towards sub-<sup>In Perugia.
Oct. 17, 1392.</sup> mission. But the unhappy parsimony of Boniface did not permit him to environ himself with a strong well-paid body of guards, which might keep down the still adverse factions in Perugia. At midnight, <sup>July 30,
1393.</sup> during the following summer, he was awakened by a wild tumult.² The exiled Guelfs, who had reëntered the city through his mediation, had risen, not without provocation, and were perpetrating fright-

¹ "Nec fuit ante eum quisquam Romanorum pontificum, qui talem potestatem temporalem Romæ et in patrimonio S. Petri exercuisse legatur." — Gobelinus, p. 318.

² Theodorici à Niem, ii. xv. He was with the Pope. See also Sismondi, *Républiques Italiennes*, t. vii. p. 350.

ful carnage on the Ghibellines. Pandolfo Baglioni, the head of the Ghibelline nobles, his brother, eighty nobles, a hundred of their followers, the Beccarini, were slain. The Pope fled in horror and disgust to Assisi. Biordo, a chief of Condottieri, in league with the Guelf Raspanti, was under the walls with 1500 adventurers. He entered the city and became its lord. Biordo's power lasted not long; he was excommunicated by the Pope. The Pope with bolder nepotism

May 22,
1394. had now created his brother Marquis of the March of Ancona. The Marquis was besieged in Macerata by Biordo, taken prisoner, and

A.D. 1396. released for a large ransom. Biordo even became master of Assisi by treachery, but himself,

Assassina-
tion. having made peace with the Pope,¹ was

A.D. 1398. murdered in Perugia by the Abbot of St. Peter's, who aspired by this good deed to the Cardinalate. "Perugia will not endure a tyrant," was the watchword of the new insurrection. The Abbot was received by Boniface, but died a short time after unrewarded. The Pope had long before the fall of Biordo determined no more to honor the fickle and perilous city of Perugia with his residence. He had returned

Rome. by urgent invitation to Rome; he made the

A.D. 1399. Capitol a strong fortress. But Rome would neither be without the Pope, nor when he was within her walls leave him in peace. The Romans took umbrage at the fortification of the Capitol; the life of Boniface was endangered in an insurrection, instigated

¹ According to Theodoric à Niem the Pope was concerned in the murder of Biordo, returned to Perugia, and fled again to Assisi. I am not quite confident that I have rightly unravelled this intricate affair, which lasted several years.

by the Bannerets of the city. He was saved by the fortunate presence of King Ladislaus with some troops. Not two years after broke out another revolt. The Pope met it with firmness. Thirteen persons were executed.¹

But the Pope had other means to reduce the contumacious city. The year of Jubilee was at hand. He treated that which had been interpolated by his predecessor but ten years before, and of which himself had enjoyed the gains, as an irregular breach on the solemn order of the Ritual. To Rome the Jubilee was of as inestimable value as to the Pope. Without the Pope it was a vain unprofitable ceremony. They sent an embassy to entreat him to vouchsafe his presence. Boniface yielded, but enforced his own conditions. His partisan, the Malatesta, was to be created Senator of Rome. The magistracy of the Bannerets, the democratic leaders of the Regions of the city, was to be abrogated forever. Boniface entered, and assumed for the first time the full sovereignty of Rome.² He had already, it has been seen, fortified the Capitol: the Castle of St. Angelo rose again from its ruins in more than its ancient strength. But this was not without a fierce struggle. Two of the Co- Jan. 1400. lonnas, lords of Palestrina, in league with the deposed Bannerets, broke into the city, and reached the foot of the Capitol with shouts, "Death to the Pope; long live the Roman people!" They were repulsed; thirty-one hung up alive.³

¹ "Egli, che non era figliuolo della paura fece prendere i delinquenti," &c. — Muratori, sub ann. 1397.

² Sozomen. Hist. S. R. I. xvi. Raynaldus, sub ann. 1400.

³ Theodoric à Niem, ii. c. xxvii. A youth was compelled by promise of pardon to hang the rest; among them were his own father and brother.

The Jubilee was held in all its pomp and all its prodigality of pardon. Pilgrims from all Christendom flocked to Rome, even from France, notwithstanding the inhibition of the King. To the French the Pope who bestowed indulgences was the legitimate Pope. The King himself, by besieging the Antipope Benedict XIII. in Avignon, and by taking him into captivity, had destroyed the awe which belonged to the holy office. Many of the wealthier pilgrims, however, brought not their rich offerings to the shrines of the Apostles in Rome. They were plundered in every part of the neighborhood, noble matrons and damsels ravished. The plague broke out in the crowded city. The Pope thought of withdrawing to a place of security, but he dared not risk the loss of Rome, the loss of the oblations. His bitter adversary taunts him with refusing alms to the plundered and dying pilgrims.¹

But a more formidable enemy to the Popedom seemed to be advancing with irresistible force. Gian Galeazzo of Milan. The first time for centuries, Italy seemed likely to fall under the dominion of a native King. Gian Galeazzo Visconti had cast off the ignoble name of Count of Virtù;² by the sanction of the Emperor Wenceslaus he was Duke of Milan. By his success in arms, by his more successful intrigues, he had obtained the power, he meditated the assumption of the title, of "King of Italy." All the great cities of Lombardy owned his dominion; Bologna, Perugia, Sienna were his. He threatened at once Florence and Rome. All

¹ *Solitus enim erat rapere, nec rapta indigentibus communicare.* — A Niem, ii. 28.

² Muratori, Ann., sub ann. 1395.

the great Free Companies, all the distinguished generals, marched under the standard of the Serpent. What had a Pope, with a contested title, a Pope even with the ability of Boniface, to oppose to such puissance? and, against a King of Italy with such vast territories, wealth, ambition, what had been the Pope?

The death of Gian Galeazzo from the plague relieved the Republic of Florence and the Pope. His Sept. 8, 1402. last will¹ divided his great dominions among his sons. All the great warlike Lombard Republics, the cities of Tuscany and Romagna, were recited in that will as passing to his descendants. The Pope, with prompt ability, took advantage of the occasion. He detached the famous Alberic Barbiano, the Great Constable, from the service of Milan. Barbiano with his hands began the reconquest of the cities in the ecclesiastical territories. His avarice and extortions gave Boniface the command of wealth, wealth the command of all the mercenary soldiery in Italy, and all the soldiery were mercenary.² Had not Boniface been compelled by the failure of his health and a painful disease to retire to the warm baths of Pozzuoli, he might have witnessed the restoration of the whole patrimony of St. Peter to his rule.

During all this period the Ultramontane Kings had been laboring to extinguish the Schism. So Benedict XIII. long as the Pope at Avignon was a Frenchman, so long the King of France and the French Cardinals adhered to his cause. Their sympathy with a

¹ See the will and the magnificent obsequies in Corio, *Storia di Milano*, l. iv. p. 286.

² "Verbis confatis in aurum, auroque verso in arma, terras ecclesiæ alienatas rebellibus subactis, verbis, auro, armis potenter recuperavit." — Gobelinus, p. 323.

Spaniard was much less strong,¹ the evils of the Schism became more glaringly manifest. Immediately after A.D. 1395. the accession of Benedict XIII. the King (Charles VI.) summoned a Council of the higher Clergy of Paris. Simon de Cramault, Patriarch of Alexandria, Bishop of Carcassonne, presided in the Council over nine Archbishops, forty-six Bishops, Abbots and Doctors innumerable. The Council threw aside at once the proposition of compelling all the Christian kingdoms who supported the Italian Pontiff to submit to Benedict XIII.² It was an avowed impossibility. Three courses remained:—1. A General Council; 2. Compromise by the appointment of arbiters; but who was to choose the arbiters, or enforce their award? 3. The renunciation of both into the hands of the College of Cardinals—either the two Colleges united in one, or each to his own College. The voices were in overwhelming number for the renunciation. A stately embassy was determined of three Princes of the blood, the Dukes of Berry and Burgundy the King's sons, the Duke of Orleans his brother, three Bishops, Senlis, Poitiers, and Arras, with eight nobles. The University of Paris addressed letters to all the Cathedral chapters of France, urging them to make processions, and offer prayers for the success of this embassy. The Ambassadors arrived at Avignon. The Pope first intrenched himself behind forms; but he was at length

Ambassadors
to Avignon.

¹ "Ferunt quidem Dominos Cardinalis Gallicos odio habentes Dominum Benedictum pro eo quod erat alterius nationis quam Gallicæ, et quoniam inter se de uno Gallico post mortem Clementis VII. non potuerunt concordare, propterea in istum convenerunt."—Contin. Chronic. Theodor. à Niem, apud Eccard. i. p. 1534.

² This was called the "via facti."

obliged to admit them to an audience.¹ Gilles de Champs communicated to the Pope that the June 1, 1896. King and the Church having duly considered all other courses had determined on that of the renunciation of the two Popes. Benedict sought delay; he was Vicar of Christ, answerable to Christ in an affair of this solemn import; it must not be driven on with unseemly speed. The Ambassadors returned; they summoned the Cardinals in the King's name to Villeneuve (on the right bank of the Rhone). Of the twenty Cardinals nineteen approved the project of the King; the Spanish Cardinal of Pampeluna alone declared that it was injustice to place the legitimate Pope on a level with the intruder Boniface. Benedict attempted to propitiate the Ambassadors by courtesy and hospitality. They dined with him, he gave them the blandest promises. At length he delivered a schedule with a counter-project. The two Popes and the two ^{Benedict's} ^{counter-} ^{project.} Colleges of Cardinals were to meet in some

place bordering on France, under the King's protection. No one could discern more clearly than Benedict himself the insuperable difficulties of this scheme: it was rejected by the ambassadors of the King, by those of the University, and by the Cardinals. Their prayers, remonstrances, admonitions were vain. Benedict took a lofty tone; he commanded them under the penalties of contumacy, disobedience, unbelief, under threats of the severest procedures, to adopt his scheme and no other. Some fell on their knees, and conjured him with tears to assent to the counsels of the high and mighty Prince. Benedict replied, "They were his subjects; he was their sovereign; he was lord not only

¹ Dupuy, Hist. du Schisme, p. 43.

over them, but over all who were living in death ;¹ he had to render account to God alone ! ” The negotiations lingered on, but at length the Ambassadors returned to Paris. It was determined to enter into communication with the other great powers of Christendom. Two Abbots were sent into Germany ; the A.D. 1395. Patriarch of Alexandria, the Admiral of France, and other nobles into England. Benedict attempted to win the King of France by the grant of a tenth. This alienated the Clergy ; the King dared not levy the subsidy. The University of Paris entered an appeal against all acts of Benedict to a A.D. 1396. future one, true, and universal Pope. Benedict in a Bull annulled this defamatory libel.² The next year the University replied to the Bull by a new appeal, in which they declared that many Popes had been repudiated for their wickedness.

Two years passed. In 1398 the Assembly of the States and Clergy of France met again. There were present the Dukes of Berry, Burgundy, Orleans, the King of Navarre, eight Archbishops, thirty-two Bishops, Abbots without number, deputies from five Universities. It was announced not only that the King and the Church of France had determined the renunciation by both Popes, the Kings of Hungary, Bohemia, England,³ Arragon, Castile, Navarre, and Sicily con-

¹ “ Mortement vivants. ” — Dupuy, p. 51.

² Gersoniana, p. xii.

³ In 1398, Benedict seems to have entertained some hope of moving the King of France against the Antipope Boniface. He writes to Richard II. of England to interpose in his behalf with the King of France, whom Richard called Father (Richard had married Isabella of France), but who had long strayed from the bosom of Mother Church and the way of truth. — MS., B. M., Dec. 21, 1398.

curred in this measure as the only way to end the Schism. After long, grave, learned debate, July 27. a vast majority had resolved on the unconditional subtraction of allegiance from Benedict XIII. This act of renunciation was solemnly published with processions and prayers on a Sunday, and promulgated by letters with the King's signature throughout the realm.¹ No sooner was it published at Avignon than the Cardinals, except Pampeluna and Tarascon, disclaimed Pope Benedict; he thundered invectives against them; they withdrew across the Rhone to Villeneuve in the dominions of the King.

Peter d'Ailly, Bishop of Cambray, the most learned theologian of the age, had held the singular *Peter d'Ailly*. office of enforcing on both Popes the duty of renouncing their dignity, and submitting to a just award. At a Council at Rheims, the Bishop of Cambray received his commission from the Emperor and the King of France, and the Clergy of both realms. He had set out for Rome. He found Pope ^{A.D. 1396.} Boniface at Fondi, having subdued the tur- ^{At Rome.} bulent and marauding Count, the author or abettor of the Schism, and who had boldly alleged his refusal to acknowledge the Roman Pontiff as an excuse for plundering his dominions. The Commissioner of the Ultramontane Sovereigns returned to Rome with the Pontiff. Boniface entertained him

¹ See the Document in the monk of St. Denys, xix. c. 5. He enters at length into the conduct of Pope Benedict. Among other charges is the following: — "Successivè idem Benedictus, ad suam ambitionem hujusmodi palliandam, quosdam per diversa mundi climata mandavit falsidicos, qui non erubuerunt contra veritatem seminare, quod iidem illustris ducis legati, solum et adeo apperuerunt viam cessionis simplicis parte nostrâ, ut illico cederet, et unus Gallicus eligeretur in Papam."

with the utmost courtesy, and with vague but promising protestations of his earnest desire to close the Schism. The Pope's avaricious and ambitious brothers took alarm at the extent of his concessions. Throughout Rome were murmurs of doubt and apprehension. They feared lest they should lose their Pope, their dignity, their profit, the general pardon of the Jubilee.¹ A great deputation addressed the Pope, exhorting him to assert himself to be the true Pope, not to abandon the privilege and patrimony of St. Peter. They would hazard their lives in defence of his right. "My good children," returned Boniface, "Pope I am, Pope will I remain, despite all treaty of the Kings of France and Germany."

Peter d'Ailly had returned to France; he was now joined in a second Commission to Avignon with the Marshal Boucicaut. If the eloquence of the Bishop should not prevail, the Marshal was to employ the force of arms. Peter d'Ailly arrived in the Court of Benedict. He had first an interview with Pope Benedict. All the answer which he could obtain was, "Let the King of France issue what ordinances he will, I will hold my title and my Poppedom till I die." D'Ailly entreated him to consult his Cardinals.² In a full Consistory he delivered a long and persuasive Latin harangue. He then withdrew. The Cardinal

¹ "Se doutèrent fort les Romains, qu'ils ne perdissent le siège du Pape qui par an trop leur valoit, et portoit grand profit, et en tous les pardons generaux, qui devoient être dedans deux ans à venir, dont tout profit devoit redonder en la cité de Rome et là environ." — Froissart, iv. 67. This mission was in 1398, before the Jubilee. Dupin, in his *Life of Peter d'Ailly* (Gersoni Opera, vol. i.), has omitted this journey to Rome, so vividly described by Froissart.

² See the picturesque description in Froissart, iv. 67, compared with other accounts.

of Amiens urged the inevitable necessity of submission to the determination of the Kings of France and Germany. Pope Benedict steadily refused; "he had been invested by God in his Papacy; he would not renounce it for Count, or Duke, or King." The Consistory was in tumult; almost all the Cardinals clamored against him. The Bishop of Cambray entered again; he demanded an answer. "Pope I have written myself; Pope I have been acknowledged by all my subjects; Pope I will remain to the end of my days. And tell my son, the King of France, that I had thought him till now a good Catholic; he will repent of his errors. Warn him in my name not to bring trouble on his conscience." Such at Rome and at Avignon was the reply to overtures of peace.

The Marshal Boucicaut in the mean time was gathering his forces around Avignon. The Provençal gentlemen, with Raymond de Turenne at their head, crowded to his banner. Expectation of the pillage of Avignon, with the Papal treasures, and the plunder of the luxurious villas of the Cardinals, drew together men accustomed to fight in the Free Bands. The citizens of Avignon would have compelled the stubborn Pontiff to yield; the old man answered with dauntless courage, "I will summon the Gonfalonier of the Church, the King of Arragon, to my aid. I will raise troops along the Riviera as far as Genoa. What fear ye? Guard ye your city, I will guard my palace." But Avignon and the Cardinals capitulated at the first summons. The Pope shut himself up in his palace, and ^{Pope be-} prepared for a resolute defence. ^{sieged in} He had laid ^{his palace.} in great store of provisions, grain, oil, wine: his fuel was burned by an accidental fire; he pulled down part

of the buildings to cook the food. Boucicaut from awe, or in confident expectation that the Pontiff must soon submit, would not lead his soldiers to storm the strong Papal Palace. The Cardinals had fled again to Villeneuve; Pampeluna and Tarascon alone were still faithful to Benedict.

The Cardinals sent an embassy, three of their body, to the King. They urged the seizure of Pope Benedict, and that Boniface should be compelled by the same withdrawal of obedience to submit to the decree of a Council. They suggested their apprehensions lest Benedict should escape into the dominions of the King of Arragon, with whom he was connected by marriage. They neglected not their own interests; they stipulated that their own privileges, emoluments, expectatives should be religiously respected. None of the great benefices, bishoprics, or abbacies were to be filled till the union of the Church, the proceeds to be set apart to advance that object. The insolence, violence, and avarice of the Cardinals retarded rather than promoted peace. They were insulted in the streets of Paris.¹ The King began to waver. Instructions were sent to Boucicaut not to proceed against Benedict by force of arms, only to prevent his escape with the Papal treasures. The palace was closely blockaded; Benedict's two Cardinals in an attempt to fly were seized and thrown into prison.

Benedict had in vain entreated succor from the King of Arragon. He had offered to make Barcelona or

¹ "Et inde vulgares sumpserunt audaciam, ut cum issent ad palacia dominorum cum pomposo equitatu, eis conviciabantur, verba ignominiosa proferentes quæ cum maximâ indignatione audiebant." — Reliq. de S. Denys, xix. p. 680.

Perpignan the seat of the Papacy. "Does the priest think that for him I will plunge into a war with the King of France?" Such was ^{Benedict capitulates.} the reply of Martin of Arragon. Benedict was constrained to capitulate. The harshest part of the terms was that they were to be enforced by the hostile Cardinals and by the wealthier burghers of Avignon. The Cardinals and the burghers pledged themselves to keep strict guard, that Benedict should not leave his palace: he was their prisoner.

It was remarked that throughout this contest Benedict employed not the spiritual sword. The Pope endured the siege without hurling anathemas on his foes.¹ His malediction could only have struck in general at the King and all his nobles; the interdict, had he dared to issue it, would have smitten the whole realm. But he knew the state of the Court of France, the insanity of the King, the implacable feud between the houses of Burgundy and Orleans. The withdrawal from his allegiance by one of the furious factions which divided the Court and Kingdom insured the sympathy of the other. The Armagnacs and Burgundians, the rival Dukes, could not join in hatred or persecution of the same object. Who would know, in those superstitious times, whether the constant paroxysms of derangement which seized the King might not be attributed to the Papal excommunication? The two Augustinian Monks who had undertaken to cure the King's malady, having utterly failed in their mission,

¹ "Nec aliququaliter usus fuit contra quenquam gladio spirituali; nam sciebat non a cunctis lilia deferentibus istas iniquitates procedere, cum multi illos dampnarent, sibi favorabiliter adhærentes." — Chronic. S. Denys, xix. 8.

were arraigned for the impious magic, in which the kingdom had put its full faith, by the Bishop of Paris and the Clergy. They were beheaded at the Place de Grève as sorcerers, not as impostors; their quarters exposed to the insult and abhorrence of the furious populace.¹

For five years Benedict XIII. endured this humiliating imprisonment. The Cardinals kept
A.D. 1398-1408. jealous ward, their vigilance was unwearied, unrelaxed. Yet Benedict could not be ignorant that the Duke of Orleans now publicly espoused his cause against the Dukes of Burgundy and Berry. The University of Toulouse had entered the lists against the University of Paris, and boldly arraigned the sacrilegious revolt from the one true Pope.² Louis, King of Sicily, forced his way to the presence of the Pope. His title to his throne depended on the Papal grant. Louis tendered his full and loyal allegiance to the successor of St. Peter. Benedict knew that
March 12, 1408. his time was come. On a still evening, with the aid of a Norman gentleman, Robert de Braquemont, he stole in disguise out of the palace, unquestioned and unsearched by the guards. He passed the night in Avignon. The next morning he dropped down the Rhone to Château Rénaud, a strong fortress held by 500 soldiers of King Louis. His first act was to send for a barber; ever since he had been a prisoner he had let his beard grow.

Never was revulsion more rapid or complete. The abject prisoner of his own Cardinals, from whom half Christendom, the loyal half, had withdrawn their alle-

¹ Chron. de St. Denys. Sismondi, Hist. des Français.

² Dupuy, Hist. du Schisme.

giance, was again the Pope of France and Spain. His two faithful Cardinals were at his side, the rest in trembling submission at his feet. They dared not disobey his summons. He entertained them at a sumptuous repast. In the midst of the festivity was heard the clang of arms ; soldiers were seen with their gleaming halberds taking their stations in silence. The Cardinals sat in speechless terror. But Benedict desired only to show his power : at a sign they withdrew. The feast went on ; but if a dark tradition be true, his mercy confined itself to churchmen. Two centuries and a half afterwards the ruins of a hall were shown, in which the Pope had given a banquet of reconciliation to some of the principal burghers of Avignon, and then set fire to the building and burned them all alive.¹ Be this but an ancient legend, he compelled the citizens to rebuild the battered walls of the Papal palace : he garrisoned it with Arragonese sol-
 May 15.
 diers. The clergy of France had been again convoked in Paris. The Cardinals of Poitiers and of Saluces appeared to plead the cause of Benedict (the last time they had been his bitter adversaries). The Dukes of Burgundy, Berry, and Bourbon still held with the University of Paris, but the University of Paris was now divided. On a sudden appeared the Duke of Orleans, leading the King. It was a lucid interval in the melancholy state of the prince. Charles faltered out, at the suggestion of his brother, a declaration of his high opinion of the learning and virtue of Benedict. The Duke of Orleans took the Cross from the altar ; the King laid his hands upon it, and declared that he

Bonché, *Hist. de Provence*, ii. 432. Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, xii. p. 380.

restored to Benedict the allegiance of the realm of France: "so long as he lived he would acknowledge him alone as the Vicar of Christ." The faint gleam of doubtful reason in a madman was to determine who was the representative of God's Almighty on earth! The Bishops burst into the chant of the *Te Deum*, the bells rang out. Paris knew by those pealing sounds that Benedict was again the successor of St. Peter.¹ The King's letters announced these glad tidings to the provinces. Benedict still, to the King, to the Duke of Orleans, to the whole kingdom, professed his eager desire to extinguish the Schism. In proof of his sincerity he sent an embassy to his rival at Rome. Boniface refused to receive the ambassadors but as Pope. The Bishop of St. Pons, Benedict's Legate, and his colleagues had the prudence to yield. They were received in full Consistory. They urged a free conference, at some appointed place, to discuss the rival claims. Boniface, perhaps suffering under his painful malady, the stone, answered with bitter pride, "that he alone was Pope, Peter di Luna an Antipope." "At least," rejoined the offended ambassadors, "our master is guiltless of simony." The insult struck to the heart of Boniface. He retired to his chamber, and ere two days was dead.²

*Feast of St.
Michael.*

Sept. 29, 1404.

Oct. 1.

¹ Compare Gersoniana, p. xvi. Dupin's abstract of these proceedings is full and fair.

² Dupuy, p. 90. Theodoric à Niem, ii. 23. We read in Ciacconius: "Fuit Bonifacius unus insigniorum et prudentissimorum Pontificum, quos unquam Roma vidit, et qui plus timoris, observantiæ et obedientiæ apud Romanos cives obtinuit." Of his avarice and rapacity, and other faults, of Christian virtues, he says nothing. See also his epitaph. Boniface had a complication of fearful maladies, of which the stone was the fatal one. This extraordinary story of a proposed cure of this malady rests on the authority of the Archbishop of Florence: "Multis vulgatum est quod cum

secundum medicinam carnalem diceretur sibi, quod per coitum cum muliere liberaretur a calculo, ex quo decessit, minimè acquiescere voluit tanto sacrilegio contra divinam legem, eligens potius mori quam impudicè vivere." — S. Antonin. Chronicon, sub ann. Compare, on the other hand, Gobellinus Persona, who hates Boniface as cordially as he flattered Urban VI. Gobelinus, now in Germany, saw the workings of the avarice and rapacity of Boniface. Boniface absolutely annulled all and every one of his own acts, grants, indulgences, and dispensations, and those of his predecessors (read the whole 87th chapter), it should seem, to regrant for five years with new fees. Of his death he says, "Et sic quamvis torsionibus intolerabilibus cotidie quatitur, tamen aurum sitire non desinit." P. 323.

CHAPTER IV.

INNOCENT VII. GREGORY XII. BENEDICT XIII.

SUBMISSION to a foreign Pontiff was the last thought of the Italian Cardinals. There were only eight¹ in Rome. They solemnly swore that whosoever of them should be chosen would abdicate the Popedom so soon as Benedict should do the same. This oath was taken by Cosmo Megliorotto, who was elected, and assumed the name of Innocent VII. The ambassadors of Benedict demanded their safe-conduct as accredited only to Pope Boniface. They had been seized; they were forced to buy their release from the Commander in the Castle of St. Angelo.²

Innocent VII. had too much virtue, gentleness, and humanity for these tumultuous times.³ His first year was a year of purgatory in the Conclave. The Cardinals, headed by the Cardinal of Montpellier, would not abandon the good old profitable usages of simony. But he had to encounter more terrible enemies. Nothing can redound more to the praise at least of the firm and resolute policy of Boniface than the fierce outbreak im-

¹ Seven, Ciacconius; nine, Oldoin. I make out eight. Gobelinus gives seven names.

² Dupuy, p. 90.

³ Theodoric à Niem, ii. 34. He writes to the Archbishop of York, announcing his election, and hopes that the "desiderabilis unionis tranquillitas" may ensue on his accession. — MS., B. M., Dec. 27, 1404.

mediately after his death. The Guelfs and Ghibellines, awed by his stern conduct, had crouched in sullen repose. Innocent had hardly time ^{Insurrection at Rome.} to return to the safe Vatican Palace from his coronation in the Lateran, when Rome rose in tumult to demand the restoration of the Bannerets, and the surrender of the city to their rule. Two Colonnas, one Savelli, hastened from the fortresses in the neighborhood to inflame the insurrection against the Papal Government.¹ The Orsini were the hereditary defenders of the ecclesiastical authority. There were all the evils and miseries of a Roman insurrection — palaces pillaged, matrons and virgins violated.

Ladislaus King of Naples was in the city at the accession of Innocent; he was leagued with ^{Ladislaus of Naples.} the Ghibellines, but the champion of liberty brooded over designs fatal to liberty. He was now almost undisputed sovereign of the realm of Naples. He aspired to include Rome within his dominions. The yielding Pope endeavored to purchase the friendship, he averted the open hostility of Ladislaus, by the cession, for a certain number of years, of the Maremma. The King of Naples interposed his mediation between the Pope and the people. But the terms betrayed at once his power and his inclinations. 20,000 florins from the tax on salt, which belonged to the Papal exchequer, were awarded to the people. The Pope held the Castle of St. Angelo (Murchardon, a famous condottiere, commanded the garrison), the Capitol was surrendered to the people. The Tiber flowed between the city of the Church and the city of the people. The Senator was to be named by the Pope out of

¹ "Quod urbicolæ per ecclesiam non per cives regerentur." — A Niem.

three prescribed by the people. Ten magistrates, called the Ten of Liberty, were to be renewed every two months.¹

The Pope still endeavored to maintain a popular policy. In a creation of Cardinals, five were Romans; but the emissaries of Ladislaus were still active. A dispute arose, which led to armed strife, about the fort which commanded the Ponte Molle, and so all the northern approaches to Rome. A deputation of the people, among which were some of the most audacious and most popular leaders, two of the captains of the regions,² entered the Castle of St. Angelo. Ludovico Megliorotto, the nephew of the Pope, a bold, fiery man, an intimate associate of Murchardon the commander of the Papal troops, would not endure their plebeian insolence. As they departed, he fell on them, eleven were killed.³ Their bodies were left till night reeking on the pavement. There they were seen by Leonardo Aretino (the historian), who made his way with difficulty to the presence of the Pope. He found the old man, who was entirely guiltless of all connivance in the act, in the deepest depression and horror. He lifted his eyes to heaven, as though to call God to witness his innocence.⁴

The bell of the Capitol tolled out; the people rose to vengeance: all the palaces of the Cardinals and courtiers were pillaged. The Pope

Flight of
the Pope.

¹ Sozomen, apud Muratori, S. R. I. t. xvi. Raynaldus has the treaty sub ann. 1404.

² Capi di Rioni.

³ The murder was committed in a house, "*ubi habitabat mater Bonifacii.*" The bodies were thrown out of the window, and lay near the Amila, where the Veronica was commonly shown. — *Diarium Anton. Petri*. Murat. R. I. S. xxiv. p. 917.

⁴ Leonard. Aretin. Comm. xxx. p. 922.

and Cardinals with difficulty fled to Viterbo. The Pope had almost perished of thirst. The Abbot of St. Peter's was murdered in his sight, as also another of his Court; their bodies were cast in the highway. John of Colonna took possession of the Vatican; the arms of the Pope were defaced or covered with mud. The Colonna was ironically called John XXIII.

Ladislaus thought that his hour was come. His troops were under the walls; he hoped to hear himself welcomed as Lord of Rome. The Colonnas, the Savellis, some other Barons were prepared to raise the cry. His troops found their way into the city, and began to sack the houses.¹ But the turbulent people had not cast out the Pope to submit to a king and a stranger.² The whole city was a great battle-field. The soldiers of Ladislaus set fire to it in four quarters; but at length, after great slaughter, the King abandoned his desperate enterprise, his discomfited troops withdrew. With more than her usual versatility, Rome had her ambassadors at Viterbo imploring the return of Pope Innocent,³ offering to recognize his plenary dominion,⁴ and laying at his feet the keys of the city. Innocent was again Lord of Rome. He waited about two months, he was received in triumph. Return to Rome.

Three months after he issued his Bull of Excommunication against King Ladislaus and the Colonnas. Ambassadors from King Ladislaus were at his footstool.

¹ "Posuit ad sacchum totam Romam." — *Diarium Petri*. He was master of three Rioni.

² "E benchè li Colonnese, e li Savelli, e alcuni altri Baroni el volessero, tutto il popolo no'l voleva." — *Piero Minorbetto*, apud *Tartini*, sub ann. 1405.

³ *Theodoric à Niem*, ii. 38.

⁴ "Dominium totius Romæ."

Peace was made; the Castle of St. Angelo surrendered. In the same month, in the year after he had fled from Rome, Innocent departed from this dismal world to the quiet grave.¹

The Schism could not terminate with the death of either Pope. The Roman Cardinals could not acknowledge Benedict unconditionally without condemning their own obstinate resistance, or without vitiating their succession, and imperilling their title to the Cardinalate. An ecclesiastical head was necessary for the assertion of the ecclesiastical dominion in Rome:² it would have been wrested at once, perhaps forever, by the turbulent people from the feeble and disunited grasp of the Cardinals. Fifteen Cardinals met in Conclave. Again they administered, and all took, an oath of unusual rigor,³ that whoever might be elected Pope would at once renounce the Papacy, directly his rival at Avignon would consent to the same abjuration. Of all the fifteen, none seemed to take this oath with more promptitude and sincerity, none had for years so deeply deplored the Schism, or urged all measures for its termination so earnestly, as Angelo Corario, a Venetian by birth, now verging on eighty years of age. On his election as Gregory XII., in

Gregory
XII.

¹ The dates seem to be:—Dominion offered to the Pope, Jan. 14 (1406). Return of the Pope, March 13. Anathema on Ladislaus and the Colonnas, June 18. Ambassadors from Ladislaus, July 17. Peace, Aug. 6. Castle of St. Angelo surrendered, Aug. 9. Death of Innocent, Nov. 13.

² Theodoric à Niem, iii. See in the *Stimmen aus Rom* (on this book more hereafter) the curious account by the ambassador of the Teutonic Order of the turbulent state of Rome. His house was seized by some of the mercenary soldiers; he could not get them out, and was obliged to share it with them. He was summoned to do homage to the new Pope, but was afraid to venture through the streets.

³ The oath is in Oldoin. *Addit. ad Ciacconium*, p. 755; and in à Niem, iii. 2.

public and in private Corario seized every opportunity of expressing, in the strongest words, the same determination.¹ "His only fear was lest he should not live to accomplish the holy work." At his coronation he was seen to weep when he renewed this protestation; it was the one subject of his grave sermon. In private he declared, that for the union of the Church, if he had not a galley, he would embark in the smallest boat; if without a horse, he would set out on foot with his staff.² He refused to grant expectatives. His first act was a letter, of which the superscription might seem offensive, "to Peter di Luna, whom some nations during this miserable schism call Benedict XIII." The rest was respectful, earnest: no sacrifice could be too great for the reunion of the Church. "The mother before King Solomon was their example; to save her son's life she had ceased to be a mother. This they should do for the Church." Benedict, from Marseilles, replied with the same superscription, "to Angelo Corario, whom some in this pernicious schism name Gregory XII." The Spaniard vied with his rival in Rome in the fervor of his words: he offered to receive ambassadors with the utmost respect. "Haste, delay not, consider our age, the shortness of life, embrace at once the way of salvation and peace, that we may appear with our united flock before the Great Shepherd." Each pledged himself to create no new Cardinals, unless to keep up their equal numbers. Gregory's pacific letters to the King of France were read with joy and admiration; he was held to be an angel of light.³

¹ "Me presente," says à Niem.

² See the letter addressed to Christendom by the Cardinals at Pisa. — A Niem, *Nemus Unionis*, vi. 11.

³ In the MS., B. M. is a letter addressed to the clergy and nobility of the

Savona, on the Riviera of Genoa,¹ was named as the place where the rival Popes were to meet, each to depose himself, and to remit the election of the one supreme Pontiff to the united College of Cardinals. Ambassadors from Genoa arrived at Rome in May, offering safe-conduct, protection, the temporary cession of the city of Savona, to be occupied half by each Pope. Ambassadors arrived also from the King of France and the University of Paris.

But already to the jealous ears of some about his Court the language of Gregory had become suspicious.² He spoke, not perhaps without some ground, of the insecurity of Savona, which, as the French King now ruled in Genoa, was subject to him as its temporal lord, and in spiritual affairs owned the sway of Benedict. The advancement of one of his three nephews—ambitious, unpopular men—to the office of President of the Papal Chamber,³ and the reception of magnificent presents from Ladislaus of Naples, threw darkening doubts on his sincerity. The confessor of King Ladislaus, a Franciscan of great worldly ability, was admitted to the confidence, and never quitted the person of the Pope. The ambiguous

whole Christian world, in which he describes himself as “*ad extirpationem inveterati ac lugubris et pestiferi schismatis paternis et sollicitis studiis intendentes.*”

¹ He writes to Henry IV. of England, as one “*quem unionis hujusmodi accipimus ardentissimum zelatorem,*” announces the agreement for meeting at Savona, and solicits a subsidy, without which he cannot move; he urges Henry “*subventionis munus extendere de tuâ regali munificentia.*” Rome, June 1, 1407. He writes, too, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, soliciting a subsidy.

² Theodoric à Niem, iii. The cause of à Niem's rancorous hatred of Gregory may possibly have been personal, but his writings have a character of honesty, though full of passion. They are in general supported by other documents. Gregorius he calls throughout “*Errorius.*”

³ Camerarius.

A.D. 1407.
Meeting
appointed
at Savona.

Doubtful
conduct of
the Pope.

movements of the King and of the Pope increased the perplexity. The King's troops suddenly appeared within the walls of Rome. John of Colonna joined them. The Pope, whom some supposed to be in secret league with the King, retired, it was given out, in fear, but in slow pomp, into the Castle of St. Angelo. But the soldiers of Colonna committed some brutal outrages in a nunnery, and plundered some shops. The people rose, headed by Paolo Orsini, who commanded the Papal troops. The assailants fell into an am- June 17. bush; Nicolas Colonna and other leaders were taken and beheaded in the Capitol. Gregory put on the appearance of great joy at the discomfiture of Ladislaus; but men mistrusted his joy.

The month had not elapsed before Pope Gregory set off from Rome in state — in pontifical state, vigil of St. Lawrence. it seemed — on the holy mission of restoring Aug. 9. peace to the distracted Church. He remained Viterbo. two months at Viterbo: in September he Sept. moved to Sienna. Sienna. Michaelmas was the appointed time for the meeting at Savona.

Then began the long and weary tergiversation, the subtle excuse, the suggestion of difficulty after difficulty, the utter neglect and abandonment of all his lofty protestations, the tampering with, the breach of, the most solemn oaths. His more inveterate enemies taunt him as a hoary hypocrite:¹ he is exculpated only as a weak old man, wrought upon by his rapacious and ambitious kindred.² His first act, the alienation of some great estates of the Church for the endowment

¹ Theodoric à Niem.

² Leonard. Aretin. "Nos de Pontifice nullo modo credimus, de propinquis non dubitamus." The acts are certain.

of his three nephews, might pass as only a prudent provision in case the Papacy should be adjudged away from him.¹ There may have been ground for some other of his manifold excuses: that Venice did not furnish the galleys which alone could make him a match for the fleets of Genoa at the command of Benedict; that the land journey through Lombardy, to the friendly territory of the Marquis of Montferrat, was perilous on account of the wars raging in that district; that he was in want of money to meet his rival in equal magnificence.² A large sum was borrowed from Florence, to be forcibly reimbursed by the clergy of that city; the clergy of Rome were wrung by the unrelenting exactions of Paolo Orsini; sacred furniture and vessels were sold. All this imbittered and exasperated the clergy. But deeper and more powerful influences were at work. The kindred of the Pope would not hazard his supremacy. With King Ladislaus his title to Naples hung on the perpetuation of the Schism, at least on the maintenance of the Italian Pontiff. If there was a French Pope, a French King of Naples was inevitable.³ Gregory, while he seemed to anathematize,

¹ One was to have Faenza, another Forlì, a third Vobeto, in Tuscany; they were also to have the noble city and port of Corneto: the grants for these alienations were made but not fulfilled. — A Niem, c. xxi.

² See in the *Stimmen aus Rom* the difficulty of dealing with Gregory XII. He refused to confirm the ordinary decrees and compacts of his predecessor. He is unmanageable on such litigated points, for he is unlearned in the canon law, and always thinks that he is being cheated. Yet he will do everything himself, even the business usually despatched by the Cardinals. He grants no graces; all must depart with their affairs unsettled. In one week he had 2000 supplications, all of which were crammed into a bag, hardly ten of them were ever got out and signed. — P. 152.

³ "Veretur nunc ut abdicatione factâ, et utroque collegio ad electionem coeunte, Gallicus forte aliquis ad pontificatum sumatur, qui favorem in regno obtinendo in Ludovicum convertat." — Leonard. Aretin. *Epist.*

was ruled by Ladislaus. He still professed the profoundest solicitude for the conference, but he still raised new impediments. Monks and friars preached openly against his cowardly abandonment of his in- *Delays.* contestable rights. If Gregory and his Cardinals went to Savona, they would be murdered, such was the notorious determination of the odious Benedict. Those who urged the immediate accomplishment of his vows were coldly heard, or put to silence. The negotiations dragged on. Gregory, in a long statement, raised twenty-two objections to Savona; he insisted on some town in the occupation of a neutral power. Carrara was named, Lucca, Pisa, Leghorn. Benedict saw the advantage of advancing on his tardier rival; he moved to Porto Venere, afterwards to Spezia. Gregory to Lucca. They were not more than fifteen leagues asunder; but the one, like a water animal, would not leave the sea-shore — the other, a land animal, would not approach the sea.¹

So closed one year; another began. Towards the spring Ladislaus advanced on Rome with ^{1407, 1408.} 15,000 men. He was admitted into the city ^{Ladislaus.} ^{in Rome.} with the secret connivance of Paolo Orsini.² He gave out that he came to protect Rome from a descent meditated by the fleet at the command of Benedict. Of this descent Gregory had more than once declared his apprehension. He almost avowed his joy at this aggressive act of Ladislaus; the design of Benedict,

¹ Leonard. Aretin. p. 926.

² See the account of the entrance of Ladislaus into Rome (April 25), the public joy, the peace, abundance, and cheapness of provisions. — *Nemus Unionis*, vi. c. 9. "*Ita quod in genere omnes contentantur de dominio regis, exceptis forsan aliquibus Romanis habentibus gravamen.*" All the armed men on the other side were expelled from the city.

which he assumed as unquestionable, justified all his caution. Marshal Boucicaut had, in truth, thirteen April 25. galleys, destined for the mouth of the Tiber, to protect the city of Rome from the King of Naples; but they were kept in port by stress of weather. Ladislaus was not content with Rome; he still advanced; Perugia, Orta, Amelia, Todi, Reate, submitted to his sway.¹

The weary negotiations had gone languishing on. Gregory offered at one time to abdicate the Papacy, if he might retain his old titular dignity of Patriarch of Constantinople, two bishoprics in his native territory Venice, with the English archbishopric of York, then expected to fall vacant.² But there was now a sudden and total rupture. Gregory reassumed the unlimited Pontifical power. He declared his determination, in direct violation of the compact, to create four new Cardinals — two of his nephews, his Prothonotary, and Brother John the Dominican, Bishop elect of Ragusa, a man odious on all accounts,³ now especially so, as having not only secretly urged, but openly preached the sole indefeasible Popedom of Gregory.⁴ The old

¹ Muratori, Ann. sub ann. 1408. *Nemus Unionis*, vi. c. 27.

² A Niem, c. xxi.

³ See the letter from Satan to this Fra Joanne Dominico, wishing him "*salutem et superbiam sempiternam*." A Niem, *Nemus Unionis*, vi. 39. This *Nemus Unionis* is a very curious collection of documents made by Theodoric à Niem, selected perhaps in hostility to Gregory XII., but neither invented nor falsified. "*In hoc nemore laborantibus hypocrisis Veneta (of Gregory XII.) argutia Cathalonica (Benedict XIII.) versutia Sicula (Ladislaus) fallacia Genuensis, elegantia Gallica, sinceritas Theutonica, et sequitas Portugallica obviabant*." — In Pref.

⁴ See *Nemus Unionis*, tract. iv. c. 4, for the arguments against the cession of Gregory. "XV. Quia sic privarentur Italici injustè tanto honore Sedis Apostolicæ et Ecclesia transferretur ad Gallicos, ad Avinionenses. XVI. Quia Italici post renunciationem divulgabuntur per universum or-

Cardinals were summoned to his presence. They sat in mournful stillness ; they heard the Pope condescend to communicate his purpose. One broke out, "Let us die first." Another fell at his feet. Defiance, protest, entreaty, moved not the impenetrable old man. He heard that they were meditating flight to Pisa. At the same time came forth a Bull for the creation of the four Cardinals, and an inhibition to the rest to leave Lucca. Paolo Guinigi, Lord of Lucca, interposed ; he refused to permit any violence to be used against the Cardinals. They withdrew to ^{Cardinals} Pisa : there they published an appeal to a ^{at Pisa.} General Council. Their taunting address¹ reminded the Pope of his vow to go on foot with his staff to accomplish the union of the Church. They asserted that they had been in danger, if not of their lives, of imprisonment in noisome dungeons : manacles and fetters had been prepared in the Pope's palace.² Gregory could not be silent. He haughtily declared them unworthy of reply, but he did reply. He accused them of secret and suspicious conversations with the French ambassador and those of Peter di Luna. He utterly denied all designs against their lives and liberties. They alleged, he said, that they had sworn to go to Pisa, but not to go without the Pope.³

hem terrarum insensati, vecordes, ignari, quia tantam gloriam Papatus perdidit: et Gallici prædicabuntur sensati, animosi, sapientes, quia licet falsum Papam habuissent tamen vicerunt." It was a strife of Italy and France for the Poppedom. Compare iv. 8.

¹ Dated May 14.

² Apud Raynald. sub ann.

³ Read the letter of the University of Paris to the Cardinals at Pisa: "*Superfluum putamus referre, quoties requisitæ fuerunt dilationes, refutationes, et illusiones quibus jam orbem fatigaverunt. . . . Credimus neminem tam improbum, tam perditum, tamque eorum similem inveniri posse, qui*

Christendom had beheld with indignation this miserable game of chicanery, stratagem, falsehood, perjury, played by two hoary men, each above seventy years old. But the great European kingdoms were too much divided, too much agitated by intestine disunion, to act together in this momentous common cause. Benedict XIII., taking courage from the more tardy movements and more glaring violation of faith in his adversary, seemed resolved to assert his Papal title by an act of Papal arrogance. France had threatened to stand neutral and to withdraw her allegiance from both Popes. Benedict presumed no doubt on the state of affairs, the hopeless derangement of the King, the deadly feud still raging between the houses of Burgundy and Orleans. A Christian preacher had startled even the low morality of that age, by vindicating the assassination of the Duke of Orleans. Benedict prepared two Bulls: one, the more violent, had been drawn up in the year 1407; one during the present year, in a more mitigated tone. Both, however, arraigned the King of France, more or less directly, as under the seduction of the devil, and as inflaming the Schism in the Church. All who were guilty of this crime, even though clothed in the highest temporal or spiritual dignity, he pronounced under excommunication — excommunication from which they could be absolved only by the Pope himself, and on the bed of death. Their kingdoms were threatened with interdict. The milder Bull, more distinctly addressed to the King of France,

Indignation
of Christen-
dom.

Benedict's
letter of
excommuni-
cation.

posthac eos defendendos arbitraretur, nisi forsitan is fuerit, quem eadem infauti schismatis cognatio in damnatam hæresim demerserit." — *Nemus Unionis*, vi. 15.

expostulated with him as a father with a disobedient son, but warned him against those awful censures.¹

The Pope's messengers were instructed to deliver these Bulls into the King's hands, and to return with all speed. They were apprehended and thrown into prison. The King was sane enough to assemble nobles, prelates, some members of the parliament, and deputies from the University of Paris. John Courtecuisse, a distinguished theologian, delivered a sermon ^{Monday,} on the text, "His iniquity shall fall on his ^{May 21, 1408.} own head." He exhibited thirteen articles against Peter di Luna, called Benedict XIII. He charged him with perjury, for not fulfilling his vow of abdication; with heresy, as having asserted that the Pope would be guilty of a deadly sin, if he should renounce the Popedom, even to restore unity in the Church of God.² The Bulls were declared illegal, treasonable, injurious to the King's majesty. The King gave his assent to the prayer, and commanded the Chancellor, the famous Gerson, to "do what was right." Gerson tore the Bulls in two; one half he gave to the nobles, one to the prelates and the delegates of the University; they rent them into shreds.³ The Pope's messengers, some days after, were brought forth in black linen dresses, on which, on one side, were painted themselves presenting the Bulls to the King; on the other the Pope's arms reversed. They had paper crowns

¹ The superscription was "Domino Regi et omnibus Dominis de sanguine et concilio." — Gersoniana, xxii.

² See the account of John de Courtecuisse (Breviscoxa) in Dupin's Gersoniana, p. xl. There is a long treatise of Courtecuisse on the Pope and General Councils in the first volume of Gerson's works. Courtecuisse was Bishop of Paris, A. D. 1420.

³ Dupuy, p. 148.

on their heads, with the inscription, "Traitors to the Church and to the King." They were placed on a high scaffold, and exhibited to the scorn and derision of the people. They were sent back to perpetual imprisonment; one got away after three years.¹

The inexorable University pursued its triumph; some of the highest and most learned prelates of the realm were assailed as being favorable to Peter di Luna. The King's proclamation was published in Italy, announcing the neutrality of France, asserting the perjury, treachery, heresy of both Popes. All churches were called on to abandon Angelo Corario and Peter di Luna. The Marshal Boucicaut had orders to seize the person of Benedict XIII., but Benedict had his galleys ready: he set sail, and arrived safe at Perpignan. Gregory took refuge in the territories of his native Venice.

¹ Dupuy, 137.

CHAPTER V.

COUNCIL OF PISA.

GREGORY XII., BENEDICT XIII., ALEXANDER V., AND JOHN XXIII.

THE mutual fear and mistrust of the rival Popes was their severest self-condemnation. These gray-headed Prelates, each claiming to be the representative of Christ upon earth, did not attempt to disguise from the world that neither had the least reliance on the truth, honor, justice, religion of his adversary. Neither would scruple to take any advantage of the other; neither would hesitate at any fraud, or violence, or crime; neither would venture within the grasp of the other, from the avowed apprehension for his liberty or his life. The forces at the command of each must be exactly balanced; the cities or sovereigns in whose territories they were to meet must guarantee, or give hostages for their personal security. They deliberately charged each other with the most nefarious secret designs, as well as with equivocation, evasion, tampering with sacred oaths, perjury.

The College of Cardinals, not only by their great public act, the summoning on their own authority a full independent Council, but even more offensively by the language of their addresses to the Popes, from whom they had severally revolted, and

Benedict
in Spain.
Gregory in
Venetian
territory.

Cardinals
summon
Council.

those to the Kings and nations of Christendom, condemned both. Each arraigned the Pope whom he had till now honored as the successor of St. Peter as guilty of the most odious and contemptible conduct, falsehood, perjury, obstinate adherence to a fatal and damnable Schism. The two parties met at Leghorn; the four Cardinals, who either of their own free will, or under compulsion, had accompanied Benedict to Perpignan, had found their way to Italy; the eight who had abandoned Gregory at Lucca — Naples, Aquileia, Colonna, Orsini, Brancaccio, Ravenna, Lucca, St. Angelo.¹ There they determined to assume, as the senate of Christendom, a dictatorial power over their Sovereign; and to call on their own authority, without the sanction of the Pope or the Emperor, the famous Council of Pisa. Strong measures must be justified by strong asseverations of their necessity. The Popes, thus superseded in the highest branch of their authority, and made amenable to a new tribunal, must first be surrendered to general aversion and scorn. The Cardinals in the *obedience* of Benedict XIII.² (new terms

¹ H. Minutolo, a Neapolitan, Cardinal of Tusculum.

Antonio Gaetani, a Roman, C. Præneste.

Odo Colonna, Roman, C. St. George in Velabro.

Giordano Orsini, Roman, C. St. Silvester and St. Martin.

Raynold Brancaccio, Neapolitan, St. Vitus and Modestus.

John de Megliorotto, of Sulmona, C. St. Croce.

Angelo Somaripa, of Lodi, C. St. Pudentiana.

Peter Stefaneschi, Roman, of St. Angelo.

² Guy de Malesicco, a Poitevin, C. of Præneste.

Nicolas Brancaccio, Neapolitan, C. Albano.

John de Brogniac, Frenchman, C. of Ostia.

Peter G. Dupuy, Frenchman, C. of Tusculum.

Peter de Thurcy, Frenchman, C. St. Susanna.

Amadeo of Sauzzo, Piedmontese, C. St. Maria Nuova.

Angelo di St. Anna, Neapolitan.

The Cardinals of Milan, Peter Philargi of Candia, afterwards Pope Alex-

were required to express new relations) maintained in their summons to their Pope some words of respect. They addressed him as Pope; they spoke of his rival as Angelo Corario. But in their letter to the King of France and to the Universities, and in the circulars addressed to Christendom, he was, as the author and maintainer of the Schism, wicked as the Jews and the heathen soldiers who would rend the seamless robe of Christ. His utter insincerity, his artifices, his obstinacy, his contempt of his oaths, were exposed in unambiguous words.¹ The Cardinals in the obedience of Gregory were more unmeasured in their reproaches. On the instant of their secession or escape from Lucca, the city walls were lined with a fierce satire against Gregory, in which invective and ridicule vied in bitterness.² It purported to be a summons not only from the Cardinals, but from all the officers of the Papal Court down to the grooms of the kitchen and stable; it summoned Gregory to appear in Lucca on a certain day, to be degraded not only as a man of blood, without honor, the slave of his carnal affections, but as a drunkard, a madman, a proclaimed heretic, a subverter of the Church of God, an accursed hypocrite. It deposed all his adherents, especially his four new Cardinals.³

ander V., and De Baro, à Spaniard, Cardinal of St. Agatha, soon appeared. Then the Cardinals of Bordeaux, of Urbino, and de Frias, Cardinal of Spain.

¹ D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, i. 818.

² This placard is in the work of à Niem. It is entitled *Epistola Delusoria*. L'Enfant supposes that it was really the work of the Cardinals. It is manifestly a furious satire against all parties, perhaps by à Niem himself. — L'Enfant, *Concile de Pise*, i. p. 235.

³ Compare in the *Nemus Unionis* à Niem's correspondence with one of the Cardinals; his address to the Pope (was it delivered?), and his descrip-

Their avowed proclamations were hardly more seemly in language. They darkly described and attributed to him and to his adversary all the evils of the Schism. They had chosen him as the best and most holy of their order; he had sworn deeply, repeatedly, solemnly, to extinguish the Schism by renunciation; he had afterwards declared such renunciation diabolic and damnable, as though he had taken the keys of St. Peter only to acquire the power of perjuring himself, and of giving free license of perjury to others.¹

The rival Popes were too well aware of the authority which a General Council would exercise over the mind of Christendom not to make a desperate effort to secure that authority in their own favor. They made all haste to anticipate the Council of Pisa, which the Cardinals with more dignified tardiness had summoned for the Lady-day in the following year. Benedict col-

Benedict's
Council at
Perpignan.
Nov. 1, 1408.

lected a hasty but somewhat imposing assembly at Perpignan.² It was said to have been attended by nine Cardinals, by four Prelates, invested for the occasion with the venerable titles of the four Patriarchs of the East. There were the Archbishops of Toledo, Saragossa, Tarragona; many Bishops from Arragon, Castile, and the other kingdoms of Spain, Savoy, Lorraine, still in the obedience of Benedict XIII. The Scotch Bishops had not time, or were prevented from attendance. There

tion of the perplexity of the courtiers, who held fat benefices: "*plerique eorum remanent nobiscum et non nobiscum, timore perditionis dictorum beneficiorum non amore.*" A Niem had no benefice, and could speak boldly and freely. He quotes, "*Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator,*" vi. c. 23.

¹ Raynaldus, A. D. 1408, No. xxxiii.

² L'Enfant, Concile de Pise, i. 221. Martene, Anecd. ii. 1476. A Niem, De Schismate, iii. 37. Aguerre, Concil. Hispan.

were even some Prelates from France, notwithstanding the declaration of the King and Parliament of their absolute neutrality, and although the Archbishop of Auch had been deposed, and the Archbishop of Rheims himself had fallen into disgrace for his obstinate resistance to the will of the King and of the nation. The assembly at Perpignan assumed all the formalities of an Œcumenic Council; but the event answered neither these lofty pretensions, nor the bold hopes of Benedict. Violent disputes arose as to the course which they should counsel the Pope to pursue. The higher dignitaries gradually shrunk away, till the Pope was left with but eighteen Prelates. The final deliberations of this remnant of a Council, with their results, are among the irreconcilable contradictions of this period. By most accounts Benedict consented to send ambassadors with certain powers and intructions to Pisa. Some of them were arrested at Nismes by order of the King of France; the Archbishop of Tarragona with others hardly escaped stoning by the populace at Pisa. On their application for passports the Cardinal Legate of Bologna declared that if he found them in the city with or without passports he would burn them alive. Yet among the charges presented against Benedict in the Council of Constance, he is affirmed to have treated his own Council with contemptuous harshness, and to have repelled them from his presence. He certainly retired to the strong fortress of Peniscolá, and there in sullen dignity awaited the event.

Gregory's proposed Council was even more inglorious: it had not where to hold its humble state.¹ No one great city was open to the

Gregory's
Council.

¹ See MS., B. M. Summons to the Irish Church to send the Bishops of

poor old Pontiff. Rome was in the possession of King Ladislaus, who in outward friendship with Gregory, was making suspicious advances to the Council of Pisa. Florence held a synod of her own, condemnatory of both Popes. The Council of Pisa was in her territories, under her protection. The Cardinal Legate, that Legate Balthasar Cossa, was Tyrant of Bologna: he looked to rule for his own ends the Council of Pisa. The learned University of Bologna declared against both Popes; his native Venice would not embark in the desperate cause of her countryman Angelo Corario; her grave ambassadors gave cold counsel to the Pope to submit and renounce his dignity. Ravenna, Aquileia, Capua, even Ephesus, then for a brief time in the occupation of the Christians, were named. At length in an obscure corner of the Venetian territory, at Ciudad in the Friuli, a few Prelates were gathered to assert the indefeasible right of the old deserted Gregory XII.; to hear his feeble murmurs of anathema against his antagonists. But this was after the Council of Pisa had held her sittings.¹

That Council of Pisa rose in imposing superiority above these secluded and fugitive conciliabules, as they were tauntingly called. Under the stately nave of the Cathedral in that city, where the aspiring Lombard or rather Italian architecture had lifted the roof to a majestic height yet unequalled in Italy, even by Gothic Assisi, and supported it on tall harmonious pillars (even now the noblest model of the Italian Basilica, expand-

Waterford and Lismore to the General Council. Sienna, Aug. 13, 1408. Gregory XII. sends the Cardinal Bishop of Porto, Legate to England and Ireland. He could be ill spared from the College of Cardinals. But the mission was of paramount importance. Jan. 17, 1409.

¹ Labbe, Concilia. A Niem, De Schismate. L'Enfant, i. p. 295.

ed into the Latin cross) ; where over the altar hovered the vast and solemn picture of our Lord with the Virgin on one side, St. John on the other, in which Cimabue made the last and most splendid effort of the old rigid Byzantine art to retain its imperilled supremacy ; and thus Latin Christianity seemed to assert its rights against Teutonic independence before their final severance : beneath these auspices met the most august assembly as to the numbers and rank of the Prelates, and the Ambassadors of Christian Kings, which for centuries had assumed the functions of a representative Senate of Christendom. At first fourteen Cardinals, seven in each obedience, took their seats ; the number grew to twenty-one or two, and finally, on the arrival of the Legate of Bologna with three others, to twenty-six ; four Patriarchs — Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Grado. Twelve Archbishops, eighty Bishops appeared in person ; fourteen Archbishops and a hundred and two Bishops by their procurators.¹ Eighty-seven Abbots, among the Cistercians those of Clairvaux, Grammont, Camaldoli, represented each his order ; there were the Procurators of two hundred more ; those of the Præmonstratensians and of St. Antony in Vienne appeared for all their Order with forty-one Priors ; the Generals of the Franciscans, Dominicans, Carmelites, Augustinians, the Grand Master of Rhodes, the Prior of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre, the Proctor General of the Teutonic Knights. The Universities sent their delegates — Paris, Toulouse, Orleans, Angers, Montpellier, Bologna, Florence, Cracow, Vienna, Prague, Cologne, Oxford, Cambridge ; as did

¹ There are considerable variations in the lists, as published in D'Achery, in Raynaldus, and by L'Enfant. Compare L'Enfant, i. pp. 239, 240.

the Chapters of a hundred Metropolitan and Collegiate churches. There were three hundred Doctors of Theology and of Canon Law. The hierarchy of France were in the largest numbers; but Italy, Germany represented by the Procurators of the Archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, Saltzburg, and Magdeburg, and England by those of Canterbury, York, London, Winchester, and many others, by the Bishops of Salisbury (the famous Robert Hallam), St. David's, Carlisle, perhaps Chichester — added their weight, as did Poland and Hungary. Even Spain had one or two Bishops. There were also ambassadors from the Kings of France, England, Portugal, Bohemia, Sicily, Poland, Cyprus; from the Dukes of Burgundy, Brabant, Pomerania, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Landgrave of Thuringia, and many other German Princes. The Kings of Spain alone stood aloof as not having renounced the allegiance of Benedict, to whom also the Kings of Hungary, Scotland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark gave a doubtful support. Ladislaus of Naples alone adhered to Gregory, from enmity to Florence rather than from friendship to the Pope. The Emperor Robert — or rather the claimant of the empire, elected on the deposition of Wenceslaus, whose indefeasible title was still acknowledged in some parts of Germany — alone of sovereign princes by his ambassadors contested the legality of the Council, its self-constituted authority, and its right of adjudication in the cause of two Popes, one of whom must be the legitimate Pontiff.

The Council conducted its proceedings with grave
Proceedings of the Council. regularity, or rather (there were rare exceptions) with dispassionate dignity. It seemed

profoundly impressed with the sense of its own unprecedented position, and the extraordinary and dictatorial power which it had been compelled to assume contrary to the usage of the last centuries. The assertion of the supremacy of a General Council, of a Council unsummoned by the Pope, was a doctrine which needed the boldness, authority, learning, and weight of such men as Gerson, the Chancellor of Paris,¹ to vindicate. The Treatise of that all-honored man was acknowledged as the one work which contained and summed up with irrefragable force and erudition the arguments in favor of the Council.²

The Council met on Lady-day; but, in the commencement of the fifteenth century, that almost holiest of days must not be profaned by business even of that solemn importance. At the close of the first March 26. formal session on the next day, proclamation was made at the gates of the Cathedral, demanding whether Peter di Luna or Angelo Corario were present, either by themselves, their Cardinals, or Procurators. Three times on successive days this citation was repeated; at the close, neither Peter di Luna nor Angelo Corario

¹ John Gerson was born 14th Dec. 1363, of a family devoted to the Church. His three brothers were monks. He studied at Paris under Peter d'Ailly in 1392 or 1395, succeeded Peter d'Ailly as Chancellor of the University. He had been the delegate of the University to both Popes. — Dupin, *Vita Gersoni*.

² Gersoni Opera, ii. p. 114. His doctrine was this: "*Unitas Ecclesiæ semper manet ad Christum sponsum suum. . . Et si non habet vicarium, dum scilicet mortuus est corporaliter vel civiliter vel quia non est probabiliter expectandum quod unquam sibi vel successoribus ejus obedientia præstetur a Christianis, tunc Ecclesia, tam divino quam naturali jure, potest ad procurandum sibi vicarium unum et certum semet congregare ad Concilium Generale representans eam, et hoc non solum auctoritate Dominorum Cardinalium, sed etiam adjumento et auxilio cujuscunque Principis, vel alterius Christiani.*"

making answer, they were pronounced in contumacy. The prelates and ambassadors from the more distant lands arrived but slowly; the Council occupied its time with sermons and the discussion of preliminary matters, the hearing and dismissing the ambassadors of the Emperor. The more solemn business commenced with the arrival of the French and English ambassadors (France had at first been represented only by the Bishop of Meaux), Simon de Cramault Patriarch of Alexandria, Giles de Champs Bishop of Coutances, and two doctors, Robert Hallam Bishop of Salisbury, Henry Bishop of St. David's, the Prior of the Benedictines in Canterbury, Thomas Abbot of St. Mary's Jervaulx, the Earl of Suffolk, and several doctors. They rode into Pisa with great pomp with two hundred horses in their train.¹

One month had almost fully elapsed, when the Advocate Fiscal, the Secretary of the Council, read certain resolutions framed by the promoters of the cause: among these, that the Holy Council was canonically called and constituted by the two Colleges of Cardinals now blended into one; that to them it belonged to take cognizance of the two competitors for the Papacy. The Advocate read a long and elaborate report on the origin and progress of the Schism. He concluded with this proposition: "Seeing that the contending Prelates had been duly cited, and, not appearing, declared contumacious, they were deprived of their pontifical dignity, and their partisans of their honors, offices, and benefices; if they contravened this sentence of deposition, they might be punished and chastised by secular judges; all kings, princes,

Two Popes
declared to
be deposed.

¹ L'Enfant, p. 269.

and persons of every rank or quality were absolved from their oaths, and released from allegiance to the two rival claimants of the Popedom."¹ The promoters demanded the hearing of witnesses to the facts deposed. The hearing of witnesses proceeded ; but before many days the Council found that this hearing would draw out to an interminable length. They declared the main facts matters of public notoriety. All went on in slow form. One Prelate alone departed from the grave dignity of the assembly, the Bishop of Sisteron in Provence, an Arragonese, up to this time a strong partisan of Benedict XIII. In his sermon, on "Purge away your old leaven," he caused astonishment among the audience by asserting that they were no more Popes than his old shoes ; he called them worse than Annas and Caiaphas, and compared them to the devils in hell.² First was pronounced the general subtraction of obedience from both Popes. On the 5th June, proclamation having been again made for their appearance and no answer heard, the gates of the Cathedral were thrown open, and the definitive sentence read by the Patriarch of Alexandria. "The Holy Universal Council, representing the Catholic Church of God, to whom belongs the judgment in this cause, assembled by the grace of the Holy Ghost in the Cathedral of Pisa, having duly heard the promoters of the cause for the extirpation of the detestable and inveterate Schism, the union and reëstablishment of our Holy Mother Church, against Peter di Luna and Angelo Corario, called by some Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., declares the crimes and excesses, adduced before the Council, to be

¹ Concilia, sub ann.

² L'Enfant, p. 273, from the Abbot of St. Maixant.

true, and of public fame. The two competitors, Peter di Luna and Angelo Corario, have been and are notorious schismatics, obstinate partisans, abettors, defenders, approvers of this long schism; notorious heretics as having departed from the faith; involved in the crimes of perjury and breach of their oaths; openly scandalizing the Church by their manifest obstinacy, and utterly incorrigible; by their enormous iniquities and excesses they have made themselves unworthy of all honor and dignity, especially of the Supreme Pontificate; and though by the canons they are actually¹ rejected of God, deprived and cut off from the Church, nevertheless the Church, by this definitive sentence, deposes, rejects and cuts them off, prohibiting both and each from assuming any longer the Sovereign Pontificate, declaring for further security² the Papacy to be vacant." The rest of the sentence pronounced Christians of all ranks absolved from all vows and engagements towards them, uttered excommunication and other canonical penalties against all who should succor, abet, or harbor either of them. Whosoever should refuse obedience to this decree, the competitors or their abettors, were to be repressed by the secular arm. All censures, excommunications, interdicts, issued by the two pretendants, were annulled; all promotions since May, 1408, declared void.³

Such was the first solemn, deliberate, authoritative act, by which a General Council assumed a power superior to the Papacy, which broke the long tradition of the indefeasible, irresponsible autocracy of the Pope

¹ *Ipsa facto.*

² *Ad cautelam.*

³ The decree may be read in à Niem, c. 44, L'Enfant, and the Concilia.

throughout Christendom. It assumed a dictatorial right in a representative body of the Church to sit, as a judicial tribunal, with cognizance of the title by which Papal authority was exercised, of offences committed by Prelates claiming to be Popes, and to pronounce in the last instance on the validity of their acts. It was much beyond a decision on a contested election; it was the cashiering of both, and that not on account of irregularity or invalidity of title, but of crimes and excesses subject to ecclesiastical censure; it was a sentence of deposition and deprivation, not of uncanonical election. Each party of Cardinals had concurred in the election of one or other of the Popes; they could not take that ground without impugning their own authority. If the Schism imperceptibly undermined the Papal power in public estimation, the General Council might seem to shake it to its base.

The Council had a harder task than the deposal of the two contesting Popes, of whom Christendom was weary, and who were abandoned by most of their own partisans. The election of a new Pope, who should command universal respect, and awe back the world into its old reverence for the Supreme Pontiff, was the necessary but far more difficult function of the Council. The Conclave could not be charged with precipitation. During eleven days¹ the twenty-six Cardinals ^{Election of Pope.} were occupied in their momentous consultation. The secrets of the Conclave were religiously kept. No one knew whether these days were occupied by grave and impartial deliberation or by the struggle of conflicting interests. The Cardinals must have gone beyond their own pale to have found a Prelate whose

¹ From June 15 to June 26.

name for ability, learning, piety, would have extorted universal admiration. Most of them had been promoted during the Schism, as zealous partisans of either Pope, rather than as distinguished Churchmen. One alone, Balthasar Cossa, afterwards John XXIII., was known for his consummate power and energy, though certainly for no other hierarchical qualifications. But his time was not come. The warlike Legate, who had crushed the liberties of Bologna, had doubtless the sagacity not yet to aspire to the supreme dignity, probably had no chance of commanding the suffrages of the French Cardinals, to whom he was unknown, or the Italian, by whom he was too well known and feared.

The choice fell on Peter Chilargi, of Candia, of the Order of Friar Minors, commonly called Cardinal of Milan, rightly Cardinal of the Twelve Apostles. This choice may have been the final determination to set up an irreproachable man, of some fame for eloquence and learning, or a compromise between the unyielding Cisalpine and Transalpine parties. Whenever such compromise takes place, it is usually in favor of an aged Prelate; and the Cardinal of Milan was above seventy years old. Alexander V. (the name he assumed) was of such obscure origin, that it is disputed whether the Candia from which he was named was the Island of Crete, or a small village in the Milanese. Cast parentless and friendless on the world, he had become a Mendicant Friar. Beggary was not his choice only, it was his lot. His life had been blameless, studious, holy. He had studied theology at Oxford and Paris; and had been raised by the discernment of Gian Galeazzo Visconti to the tutorship of his sons. By the same influence he became Bishop of Vicenza, of Novara, and

Archbishop of Milan. Alexander V. was superior to the two vices which had loaded with reproach the fame and memory of most of his predecessors — avarice and nepotism. His weakness was prodigality. He lavished what under the existing circumstances must have been the limited and precarious resources of the Papacy with such generous profusion, that he said of himself, he had been rich as a Bishop, as a Cardinal poor, as Pope he was a beggar. On the day of his enthronement his grants were so lavish as to justify, if not to give rise to, the rumor, that the Cardinals, on entering into the Conclave, had made a vow that whosoever should be elected would grant to the households of his brother Cardinals the utmost of their demands. From nepotism Alexander V. was safe, for he was without kindred or relatives. But there was another, perhaps more fatal, nepotism which turned the tide of popularity against him — the nepotism of his Order. It was more than the accumulation of all the offices of his Court on his beloved brethren, more than the lavish grant of bishoprics and dignities — it was the undue elevation of the Franciscans¹ above all the Secular, all the Regular Clergy. Two hundred years had not allayed the strife of the Mendicants and the Clergy. From the highest seats of learning to the most obscure country parish, there was rivalry, strife, jealousy, hatred. Still the theory of the Church, her whole discipline, depended on the sole and exclusive authority of the lawful pastors in their parishes, and on their exclu-

¹ “ Aliquos etiam Fratres Minores sibi charos et sociales publicis officiis et lucrativis quæ prius consueverant regi per seculares personas habiles et expertos in eâdem suâ curiâ præfecit, et miro modo conabatur plerosque Fratres Minores Cathedralibus Ecclesiis præficere ut pastores.” — A Niem, iii. c. 51.

sive right to perform the services of the Church, to hear confession, to grant absolution. Some high-minded and far-seeing among the Prelates or the Clergy might welcome the Friars as active and zealous coadjutors in the task of Christianizing mankind; they might keep on terms of mutual respect and harmony. The Mendicants might even, by their noble exertions under terrible exigencies, as declared in the Consistory of Avignon after the great plague, command the unwilling approbation of Cardinals and Popes.¹ But in general they were still hated with unmitigated hatred by the Clergy: by some of the better, as unjustly interfering between them and their beloved flocks, and as alienating and seducing away their people's affections; by the worse, as a standing reproach on their negligence and ignorance, and as drawing off to themselves the emoluments which the Clergy deemed their sole right — the oblations, the gifts, the bequests. The inevitable degeneracy of the Friars would no doubt aggravate the strife. The Mendicant Orders had spread their net too wide not to comprehend multitudes of men with no other qualification than beggary. So soon as they became, if not rich, with the advantages of riches, with splendid convents, ample endowments, or even the privilege of subsisting at the cost of others, they would become little better than what they had been long called by their adversaries in England — sturdy beggars. Up to this time the Popes (as has appeared in our history)² had left some restraint on the Friars. They were too useful partisans, too much under the

¹ See above, p. 58.

² Compare Book xi. c. 2. L'Enfant has given the substance of the former Bulls, p. 309, &c.

Papal control, not to find as much favor as could be granted without absolutely estranging the Clergy; yet the Bishops retained some power over them; and the Popes had refused absolutely to abrogate the exclusive privileges of the secular clergy. The relations of the two rival bodies were still kept in a kind of politic balance, and rested on vague and contradictory decrees.

The Bull of Alexander V., issued but a few months after his accession, rudely struck down the barrier.¹ It invested the Friar Preachers, Bull of Alexander in favor of the Friars. Oct. 12. the Friar Minors, the Augustinians, and the Carmelites, in the full, uncontrolled power of hearing confession and granting absolution in every part of Christendom. It rescinded, and declared null, if not heretical, seven propositions advanced or sanctioned by other Popes, chiefly John XXII. One of these it averred, with unnecessary insult and disparagement of the Papal infallibility, to have been issued by that Pope, when under condemnation for heresy. These propositions had enacted that without the consent of the parish priest, or at least of the Bishop, no Friar could hear confession. This Bull was not only the absolute annihilation of the exclusive prerogatives and pretensions of the Clergy, but it was ordered to be read by the Clergy themselves in all the churches in Christendom. They were to publish before their own flocks the triumph of their enemies, the complete independence of their parishioners on their authority, their own condemnation for insufficiency, their disfranchisement from their ancient immemorial rights. Henceforth there was a divided dominion in every diocese, in

¹ Relig. de St. Denys. Laboureur's translation of the Bull may be read in *L'Enfant*, p. 814.

every parish there were two or more conflicting claimants on the obedience, the love, and the liberality of the flock. Still further, all who dared to maintain the propositions annulled by the Bull were to be proceeded against as contumacious and obstinate heretics. Thus the Pope, who was to reconcile and command or win distracted Christendom to peace and unity — a narrow-minded Friar, thinking only of his own Order — had flung a more fatal apple of discord into the world, and stirred up a new civil war among the more immediate adherents of the Papacy, among those who ought to have been knit together in more close and intimate confederacy.

The reception of this Bull in Paris, though its injurious workings were more openly and indignantly resented in Paris than elsewhere, may show its effect throughout Christendom. The old war of the University with the Dominicans and Franciscans, which had ended in the humiliation of their champion William of St. Amour, and the triumphant participation by their intrusive rivals in their ancient privileges (perhaps not mitigated by the assumption of the mastery over her schools by the great Dominican and Franciscan teachers, Albert the Great, Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus), was not beyond the scope of their recollection. The tradition of academic jealousy and rivalry is endowed with pertinacious vitality. They rose in almost unanimous insurrection. The University of Paris had hailed with acclamations the accession of Pope Alexander. No sooner had this Bull arrived in the city, than, with contemptuous doubts of its authenticity, they sent delegates to Pisa to inquire whether it was genuine. The delegates would not be

University
of Paris.

satisfied without seeing the leaden seal attached to the Bull.¹ The Bull professed to have been framed with the advice and consent of the Cardinals ; the delegates visited and inquired separately of the Cardinals whether they had given such advice and consent, thus tacitly accusing the Pope of falsehood or forgery. The Cardinals disclaimed all participation in the decree ; they did not deny that it was injurious to all who had the cure of souls.

The University, on the report of her delegates, proceeded to expel all Mendicant Friars from their walls, and to prohibit their preaching in Paris till they had produced and renounced the original Bull. The Preachers [Dominicans] and the Carmelites declared that they had no knowledge of the Bull, that they were content with the privileges possessed before the time of Alexander V. But the Franciscans, proud of a Pope from their own Order, went about defying all authority, and boasting that to them alone it belonged to preach, to hear confession, and even to levy tithes.² The King interposed ; on their convent gates was affixed a royal proclamation, forbidding Priests and Curates to permit the Franciscans or Augustinians to preach or hear confession in their churches.³ The

¹ "A Pope's Bull and a Pope's Brief differ very much, as with us the great seal and the privy seal; the Bull being the highest authority the Pope can give, the Brief is of less. The Bull has a leaden seal upon silk, hanging upon the instrument; the Brief has *sub annulo Piscatoris* upon the side." I quote this from Selden's Table Talk, on account of the illustration.

² A Niem describes the joy of the Franciscans at the elevation of Alexander V.: "Mirabiliter lætificati sunt; discurrebant enim per vicos et plateas civitatis catervatim valde multi eorum per singulos dies, velut essent mente capti." — iii. c. 53.

³ Relig. de St. Denys.

Chancellor Gerson, the Oracle of the Council, denounced the act of the Pope in no measured language.¹

Whatever tended to destroy the popularity of Alexander threw discredit on the Council of Pisa. Murmurs were heard in many quarters that the Council instead of extinguishing the Schism, had but added a third Pope. Benedict from his fastness at Peniscola issued his anathemas against the Council and against his rivals. Gregory had been obliged to take ignominious flight from the territories of Venice; Gregory and Ladislaus in Rome. he found refuge with Ladislaus. As the price of his security, and for 25,000 gold florins, he was reported at least to have sacrilegiously alienated the patrimony of the Church, to have sold Rome, the March, Bologna, Faenza, Forlì, and all the lands of St. Peter to that ambitious King. Ladislaus unfurled his standard, which bore the menacing inscription, "Cæsar or Nothing." He occupied Rome with a large force;²

¹ Relig. de St. Denys. "Dedisti nobis unum et verum Ecclesiæ Pastorem, quem recepinus magno cum gaudio, reverentiâ et exultatione. Et ecce malignum spiritum proelii et divisionis, qui visus est suscitare turbationem novam, malam nimis, nimis coöpertam et fraudulentam sub umbrâ boni et religionis." The Christian hierarchy, writes Gerson, consists of the Pope, Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, successors of the Apostles; of curates, successors of the 70 disciples. Gerson asserts in the strongest terms the exclusive and perpetual rights of the curates to all the offices and emoluments of their function. They are more perfect than simple monks. "Sequitur statum curatorum perfectionum esse statu simplicium religiosorum." This was new doctrine. — Gersoni Opera, ii. p. 433.

² The occupation of Rome by Ladislaus is afterwards described by Pope John XXIII. as "optentu nephario atque velamine maledictionis filii Angeli Corarii, heretici et schismatici, per generale Pisan^m Concilium justo Dei judicio sententialiter condemnati." — MS., B. M., Oct. 23, 1411. There is in the Diary of Antonius Petri (Muratori, t. xxiv.) a very curious account of the transactions in Rome day by day, of the hangings and decapitations, daily occurrences, of many of which Antonius was eye-witness. But on great events he is provokingly silent. He gives this strange inscription on

he had made terms with Paolo Orsini, the Guelfic condottiere; he was advancing on Tuscany. Alexander, Pope without a rood of the Papal dominions, fulminated his Bulls against the ally of the deposed Gregory, the usurper of the dominions of the See of Rome. But the Pope, recognized by France, and by most of the Italian States, had more formidable forces than spiritual censures. Louis of Anjou, in whom centred the hereditary pretensions of his house to the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, appeared at Pisa with five hundred lances. Florence, who feared and hated Ladislaus, and the Cardinal Legate with his bands at Bologna, formed with Louis a strong league. Their armament moved towards Rome; Paolo Orsini advanced against him.¹ But the religion and loyalty of the captain of a Free Company depended on the highest bidder. He had no scruples in changing his service and his Pope. He marched back with Louis of Anjou to reduce Rome, which he had gone forth to protect. Oct. 1.

At first the Leonine City, the Vatican, and St. Peter's, then the Castle of St. Angelo, at length the Cisterverine region and the Capitol submitted to the conqueror. Rome acknowledged Pope Alexander V.

Alexander had been driven by the plague from Pisa to Prato; from Prato he removed to Pistoia.² Instead of taking possession of Rome he crossed the cold snowy one of the banners of Ladislaus, which he unfurled with the Papal banner:—

*Io son un povero Re, amico delle Saccomanni,
Amatore delle populi, e distruttore delle Tiranni.*—

p. 999.

¹ Antonius Petri describes the entrance of King Louis and the Orsinis, with the Cardinal St. Eustachio (Balthasar Cossa), into Rome, Oct. 1.

² The appointment of Marcello Strozzi Nuncio and Collector in England is dated Pistoia, 30th Dec. 1409. — MS., B. M.

Apennines to put himself under the protection, or to deliver himself into the hands, of the Cardinal Legate. **May 3, 1410.** In Bologna he died in peace after a Pontificate not much exceeding ten months. Rumors of course that he died by poison spread abroad, and his successor bore of course the guilt of his untimely end.¹

The Conclave had followed the Pope. After a very short interval it was announced to Christendom that twenty-four Cardinals had given their unanimous suffrages;² that Balthasar Cossa was chosen Supreme Pontiff, and had taken the name of John XXIII.³

John XXIII. is another of those Popes the record of whose life, by its contradictions, moral anomalies, almost impossibilities, perplexes and baffles the just and candid historian. That such, even in those times, should be the life even of an Italian Churchman, and that after such life he should ascend to the Papacy, shocks belief; yet the record of that life not merely rests on the concurrent testimony of all the historians of the time, two of them secretaries to the Roman Court, but is avouched by the deliberate sanction of the Council of Constance to articles which, as will

¹ "Idem dominus Alexander Papa in lecto ægritudinis constitutus Bononiæ coram suis Cardinalibus pulchrum sermonem Latinum fecit." He died four days after, May 3, 1410. In the *Chronicon* attributed to à Niem is the text of this sermon, "Pacem meam do vobis, pacem relinquo vobis."—*Apud Eccard*, p. 1536. *St. Antoninus, Chronic.*, ii. Dugloss, *Hist. Polon.*, attributes his death to a poisoned clyster. Monstrelet speaks more generally of poison. The sixth article against John XXIII. at Constance accuses John, and his physician, Daniel de St. Sophia, of the crime.—*Ap. Von de Hardt*. iv. 1, 3. But see in Monstrelet the pompous funeral.

² The list in *Ciacconius*, p. 786. It was not certain how many were actually present at the election.

³ Read in Monstrelet the account of his election and splendid inauguration, l. i. c. lxxviii.

hereafter appear, contained all the darkest charges of the historians, and to some of which John himself had pleaded guilty.

Balthasar Cossa was a Neapolitan of noble birth;¹ as a simple clerk he served in the piratical ~~His~~ youth. warfare carried on by the hostile fleets of the rival Provençal and Hungarian Kings of Naples. He retained through life the pirates' habit of sleeping by day, and waking by night. At a later period two of his brothers, who had not like himself abandoned in time that perilous vocation, were taken by King Ladislaus, and notwithstanding the influence of Balthasar with the Pope, and the Pope's strenuous exertions in their behalf, hanged without mercy. Balthasar cherished from that time an implacable hatred to Ladislaus. He retired to Bologna and studied the Canon Law, it was said without much success. He was raised by Boniface IX. to the dignity of Archdeacon of Bologna. But his ambition had higher views. He returned to Rome, and was appointed one of the Pope's chamberlains.² He became one of the dexterous and unscrupulous agents of the Pope's insatiable avarice and of his own. He was the most daring and skilful vendor of preferments, the most artful of usurers. By secret, and as they demeaned themselves to their victims, friendly messengers, he warned rich Prelates, that the Pope, ill-disposed towards them, designed to remove them from their wealthy and peaceful benefices to preferments in barbarous countries, in remote islands, or lands held by the Saracens. He received vast bribes

¹ De Vitâ Joannis XXIII., à Theodoric à Niem, apud Meibomium, i. This work must be compared with the charges entertained and confirmed by the Council of Constance, and at length admitted by John himself.

² Cubicularius.

to propitiate the unfriendly Pontiff. To him was attributed the enormous abuse of Indulgences. Already Priests and Friars, loaded with these lucrative commodities, travelled through Germany, by Thuringia, Swabia, Saxony, into the Northern kingdoms, Denmark and Sweden. On their arrival in a city they exhibited a banner with the Papal arms, the keys of St. Peter, from the windows of their inn. They entered the principal church, took their seat before the altar, the floor strewn with rich carpets, and, under awnings of silk to keep off the flies, exhibited to the wondering people, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Priests or Bishops, their precious wares. "I have heard them," writes the biographer of John XXIII., "declare that St. Peter himself had not greater power to remit sins than themselves." One of the wealthiest of these Papal merchants, on his return from his journey, was seized at Bologna. Balthasar Cossa, perhaps his former patron, but now Legate, plundered him of 100,000 florins. The poor victim hanged himself in prison.¹

Pope Boniface had formed so high an estimate of the abilities of Balthasar Cossa, that he was raised Legate in Bologna. to the Cardinalate, and appointed Legate to wrest the city of Bologna from the domination of the Visconti.² The Legate fulfilled his mission; the poor student of law, the Archdeacon of Bologna, became the lord of that city with as absolute and unlimited dominion as the tyrant of any other of the Lombard or

¹ A Niem, p. 7.

² There was another notorious, it was said, but unavowed reason for his foreign mission, his separation from his brother's wife, the sister of a Cardinal, with whom he was living in incestuous, and, even for Rome, scandalous concubinage.

Romagnese commonwealths. Balthasar Cossa, if hardly surpassed in extortion and cruelty by the famous Eccelino, by his debaucheries might have put to shame the most shameless of the Viscontis. Under his iron rule day after day such multitudes of persons of both sexes, strangers as well as Bolognese, were put to death on charges of treason, sedition, or other crimes, that the population of Bologna seemed dwindling down to that of a small city. He used to send to the executioners to despatch their victims with greater celerity. Neither person nor possession was exempt from his remorseless taxation. Grain could not be ground, nor bread made, nor wine sold without his license. From all ranks, from the noble to the peasant, he exacted the most laborious services. He laid taxes on prostitutes, gaming-houses, usurers. His licentiousness was even more wide and promiscuous. Two hundred maids, wives, and widows, with many nuns, are set down as victims of his lust. Many were put to death by their jealous and indignant husbands and kindred. The historian wonders that in so rich and populous a city no husband's, or father's, or brother's dagger found its way to the heart of the tyrant.¹

So is Balthasar Cossa described by Theodoric à Niem, his secretary. Leonardo Aretino, another secretary, in pregnant and significant words, represents him as a great man, of consummate ability in worldly affairs, nothing or worse than nothing in spiritual.

¹ Yet the Chronicle, or rather the Continuation attributed to à Niem, speaks thus of his nearly nine years' administration of Bologna: "Floruit multum civitas et adaucta est longâ pace." But the author, who passes over Cossa's early life, admits that before the Council of Constance above forty charges were proved, some against his life, some against his doctrine; and that John XXIII. admitted their truth. —Apud Eccard, p. 1537.

At the death of Alexander V. the Conclave, of sixteen Cardinals at least,¹ in Bologna, were entirely in the power of this ambitious and unscrupulous man. They may have discarded the suspicions awakened by the opportune death of Alexander, though, as has been said, among the crimes afterwards not only murmured in secret, but alleged against John XXIII., was that of having poisoned his predecessor: no man whose death was important could be suffered to die in the course of nature.

The election, though without actual violence, may have been compulsory; yet at Constance, though almost all the Cardinals bear testimony against John, this does not seem to have been among the charges.² But the awe, the terror of his character and of their perilous situation may not have been less real. They may have wilfully closed their eyes (dastardly or almost impossible as it may seem) against his crimes and vices, allowing themselves to be dazzled by his higher qualities, his energy, courage, military skill, success. He was the Pope to restore the Papal interests in Romagna, in Italy, in Christendom. Already Cardinal Cossa had won back Rome to the dominion of his predecessor. He had his own powerful forces; he had bought over Paolo Orsini; with his close confederate, Louis of Anjou, he had made Ladislaus of Naples tremble on his throne. The ambassadors of Louis were in Bologna, strongly urging the election of their King's useful, indispensable ally.

No wonder if the secrets of that Conclave were be-

¹ The number present varies. See above.

² This charge had been a condemnation of their own weakness and want of Christian courage.

trayed; it is still less wonderful that the accounts are contradictory; none would wish, none would dare to speak the truth. Each as his own exculpation might require, or his hatred predominate, would color the facts. Cossa, it is said, appalled the Conclave with his threats; he scornfully rejected each name proposed; in their fear and discord they left him to name the Pope. He demanded the stole of St. Peter to array the worthiest, put it on his own shoulders — “I am Pope.”¹ By another account he proposed the Cardinal Caracciolo, an unlearned, rude, and most unfit man. On his rejection Cossa himself was chosen.² The same writer in another place speaks of unmeasured bribery. Perhaps the simple phrase of a third may be most true — he owed his election to the troops at his command.³ But whatever their motives, fear, deception, corruption, foreign influence — whether affrighted, cajoled, bribed, dazzled — the Conclave refused to remember the enormities of the life of Balthasar Cossa; the pirate, tyrant, adulterer, violator of nuns, became the successor of St. Peter, the Vicegerent of Christ upon earth.⁴ Cossa was Pope; Louis of Anjou hastened to kiss the feet of his brother-in-arms; fourteen ecclesiastics, some of the wisest and ablest Prelates of Italy, accepted the title and rank of Cardinal at his hands. He fulminated his sentence of excommunication against the deprived Antipopes Gregory and Benedict; against King Ladislaus, whom he deposed from his throne.

¹ Philip of Bergamo. Supplem. Chronic. L'Enfant, ii. p. 4.

² Theodoric à Niem, Vit. Johan. XXIII. In his *Invectiva*, à Niem accuses Cossa of having broken up the threshold with a golden axe, and given a sop to the Molossian hounds.

³ Platina.

⁴ “In cujus electione multi scandalizati sunt, quia ut tyrannus rexisee Bononiam, vitæ mundanæ deditus dicebatur.” — Gobelinus, p. 330. This is at the least less passionate authority.

At first the united forces of the Pope and Louis of Anjou met with some reverses; but during the next year, at the battle of Rocca Secca, Ladislaus suffered a total defeat. But Louis of Anjou, with his French impetuosity, knew not how to profit by his victory. "On the first day," said Ladislaus, "my person and my realm were at the mercy of the enemy; on the second my person was safe, but my realm was lost; on the third hope arose for my realm as well as my person."¹ Pope John had already advanced to Rome. No sooner had he left Bologna than the whole city rose with cries of Long live the people! Long live the Arts!² The Cardinal Legate fled to the citadel, from whence he looked down on the plunder of the palace; in a few days he was compelled to surrender at discretion. The Pope at Rome received with exultation the tidings of the battle of Rocca Secca. The standards of the vanquished Ladislaus were dragged ignominiously through the miry streets. But the triumph was short; Louis had in vain attempted to force the passes which led into the kingdom of Naples; he returned baffled and discomfited to Rome, and after a few weeks embarked for Provence.

The Pope was left alone to the vengeance of Ladislaus. Florence had abandoned the League; he renewed his idle maledictions against a King who laughed them to scorn. He published a Crusade throughout Christendom, in Italy, France, Germany, England,³ Denmark, Norway, Prussia, Poland,

¹ St. Antoninus, p. 156.

² The guilds of the city.

³ MS., B. M. Not merely was the Crusade to be preached, with all the privileges of a Crusade to the Holy Land, but a subsidy implored and a tenth demanded of the clergy by the Legates, Antonio da Pineto, General

Lithuania, Hungary, even in Cyprus and the East.¹ He summoned and held a Council at Rome, but few prelates would venture their lives in the unapproachable and insecure city. The Council was only memorable for an incident, in itself ludicrous, which nevertheless struck deep fear into many hearts as a dismal omen. Immediately after the opening Mass for the descent of the Holy Spirit, a huge owl flew out, screeching and fixing its eyes on the Pope. Those who dared to laugh laughed; some whispered, "A strange shape for the Holy Ghost!" The Pope broke up the assembly. On the next day there sat the owl, with its large eyes full on the Pope. The Cardinals with difficulty drove it out with sticks and stones.² These Papal acts, the excommunication and the Crusade, which displayed the dauntlessness and energy of the Pope, had been but feeble security against the King of Naples at his gates, if the crafty Ladislaus had not found it his interest to incline to peace. King and Pope had too many enemies, too few, and those but hollow friends. The Pope would purchase, at the highest price, not only peace but the recognition of his title.³ Pope Gregory still lived under the protection of the King, in undisturbed retirement at Gaeta. Ladislaus was seized with qualms

of the Minorites, and Paul da Sulmone, Archdeacon of Ravenna. Oct. 23, 1411. The Legates had power to absolve fifty persons excommunicated for trading with Alexandria in Egypt, and all the other ordinary powers. He hoped to make an agreement with Thomas of Lancaster, the King's second son, to head an English crusade. Nov. 9, 1411.

¹ The preaching of this Crusade and the Indulgences in Bohemia was a great cause of the Hussite disturbances.

² See Clemangis, Tract, p. 75, from an eye-witness. A Niem, apud Von der Hardt, ii. 375.

³ A Niem had heard from a partisan of Gregory XII. that John XXIII. paid, and that Ladislaus received by the hands of a certain Florentine, 100,000 florins for his abandonment of Gregory. — p. 17.

of religious conscience. He summoned the Prelates and theologians of his realm, and imparted to them his grave doubts whether he were not guilty of sin in maintaining a Pope rejected by all Christendom. He paid a cold civil visit to express his profound respect and sorrow to him whom he had so long honored as Pope. Gregory had no ungrounded apprehensions lest he might be surrendered to his rival. Two Venetian merchant-ships were in the harbor; the inhabitants of Gaeta loved the poor old Pope; they bought a passage for him and his Court. The vessels sailed all round Calabria, and though pursued by the galleys of John XXIII. reached Rimini. Gregory was received by the Malatestas, the deadly enemies of Pope John.¹

Ladislaus dictated the terms of the treaty with the Oct. 1412. Pope; at least no Pope not under hard necessity had submitted to such terms. Ladislaus was acknowledged not only as King of Naples, but also as King of Sicily. The Arragonese King of Sicily adhered to Benedict XIII. Ladislaus was named Gonfalonier of the Church. The Pope consented to pay 120,000 florins of gold; he surrendered as security the cities of Ascoli, Viterbo, Perugia, and Benevento. He absolved Ladislaus from a debt of 40,000 florins, the accumulated tribute to the Papacy. The Pope was to maintain 1000 horse for the subjugation of Sicily. The Pope obtained at this vast and dishonorable sacrifice only peace and the recognition of his own title; the dismissal not the surrender of the rival Pope.²

Yet this peace did not last many months. The Pope had but time to exasperate Rome with his exactions. Though, as it should seem,

New quarrel
with Ladis-
laus.

¹ Raynald. sub ann.

² A Niem, p. 16.

himself possessed of great resources, he determined that Rome should pay for her own security. His protonotaries and referendaries wrung subsidies from the Cardinals and the clergy; the Senators from the people. A heavy duty on wine drove the populace to fury. The measure of wine usually sold at one florin rose to nine. He taxed the artisans and shopkeepers, and issued a debased coinage. The Pope was compelled to post up the abolition of the obnoxious wine-duty on all the corners of the streets.

The causes of the breach with the King of Naples are obscure, if any cause was wanting beyond A.D. 1418.

the treachery and ambition of the King, the utter insincerity and avarice of the Pope. John hoped to reap a rich harvest by deposing all the Bishops and rich beneficiaries of the kingdom of Naples who had sworn allegiance to Gregory, or by extorting heavy mulcts for their confirmation. The wines of Naples were loaded with a prohibitory duty. Ladislaus had already troops moving in the March of Ancona, urging the cities to revolt; rumors spread of his de- ^{Pope leaves} signs on Rome; his troops were at the gates, ^{Rome.} June 5. within the city. The Romans swore that June 7. they would eat their children rather than submit to the

dominion of that dragon Ladislaus.¹ The Pope went through the solemn mockery of committing the defence of the city to the patriotic heroism of the citizens; he himself fled in haste, first to Sutri, then to Viterbo, then to Montefiascone. The Cardinals and the Court followed as they might; some fell into the hands of the relentless enemy. The city, perhaps in secret in-

¹ "Nos Romani primò volumus comedere filios nostros antequam vclamus habere dominium istius Draconis." — Antonius Petri.

telligence with Ladislaus, made no resistance.¹ The Neapolitan soldiers plundered all the palaces of the Pope and Cardinals, and did not even spare the sacred buildings; they stabled their horses in the churches. They pillaged all the wealthy clergy; some lost their lives. The Pope fled by Sienna to Florence, which opened her hospitable gates to receive him, more from jealousy or dread of Ladislaus, than from respect for the Pontiff. Ladislaus had summoned Sutri, Viterbo, Montefiascone to surrender him. From Florence he withdrew to Bologna, now again submitted to the Papal rule.

In John XXIII. it might almost seem that the weight of his vices had crushed the stronger faculties of his mind. This consummate master of Italian craft had been overreached, baffled, put to shame, driven from Rome, by the superior treachery as well as the superior force of Ladislaus. He was now betrayed into a step more fatal to his power, his fame, his memory, by the overbearing energy and resolution, if it may be so said, the single-minded cunning, of Sigismund, Emperor of Germany. The Council of Constance, from which John XXIII. hoped to emerge the undisputed Vicar of Christ, the one all-honored Pope, cast him out as a condemned, degraded,

¹ According to a Niem, who describes the rupture, John XXIII. did not fly till the soldiers of Ladislaus were in the city. The Pope showed equal want of courage and ability. — p. 21. The city was weary of the taxation of the Pope. Ladislaus had many of the Romans in his pay. "*Aliqui etiam eorundem Romanorum secretè partem dicti regis tenuerunt, stipendiati per ipsum more veteri Romanorum.*" A Niem fled with him. He was in Rome, March, 1413. Ladislaus encamped in the Roman Campagna the beginning of May; the Pope fled in June. He was in Florence Oct. 7 to the beginning of November. He was at Bologna Nov. 12; in the end of that month in Lombardy. He returned to Bologna about Easter in the ensuing year.

unpitied captive, even more utterly forsaken, scorned, and downtrodden than his two old rivals deposed by the Council of Pisa.

Yet it was hard necessity which drove Pope John into close alliance with the Emperor Sigismund; and the character of Sigismund had ^{The Emperor Sigismund.} not yet disclosed its obstinate firmness and determination to enforce submission even from Popes to the deliberate desires of Christendom. He might, as far as had yet appeared, be overawed by the vigor, or circumvented by the astuteness, of a subtle Italian. At all events Sigismund was now the only safeguard against the irresistible Ladislaus. Already the Neapolitan troops had possession of the Roman territory as far as Sienna. Bologna, if strong in her citadel, disaffected in her city, might at any time be besieged. Sigismund might be expected to cherish profound revenge against Ladislaus for his attempt on the kingdom of Hungary.

Sigismund was now sole and uncontested Emperor. The schism in the empire had been extinguished, first by the death of the Emperor Rupert, then by that of Jodoc of Moravia, the competitor of Sigismund.¹ He was the most powerful Emperor who for many years had worn the crown of Germany, and the one unoccupied sovereign in Europe. France and England were involved in ruinous war. Henry V., by the battle of Agincourt, had hopes of the conquest at least of half France. France, depressed by the melancholy lunacy of the King, by the long implacable feuds of the Armagnacs and Burgundians, by the English victories,

¹ Ashbach, Kaiser Sigmund, gives a full and good view of all these revolutions.

had sunk far below her usual station in Christendom. Sigismund, as Emperor, had redeemed the follies, vices, tyrannies of his youth. During that youth, as Margrave of Brandenburg, his wasteful prodigality had compelled him to pawn his Margravate; he had lost the kingdom of Poland by his harsh despotism; at times passionately cruel, at times passionately merciful, his revenge on his enemies had no appearance of justice, his mercy no magnanimity. He had endangered his rightful kingdom of Hungary, by provoking the fiery Magyars to rebellion. He had attempted wrongfully to expel his brother from the kingdom of Bohemia. His immoderate love of women shocked an age accustomed to royal license. As Emperor he seemed almost at once transformed into the greatest sovereign whom the famous house of Luxemburg had ever offered to wear the Imperial crown. On his accession Sigismund declared that he should devote himself to the welfare of his subjects, as well in his own dominions as in the Empire. His conduct justified his declaration. He enacted and put in execution wise laws. He made peace by just mediation between the conflicting principalities. He was averse to war, but not from timidity. His stately person, his knightly manners, his accomplishments, his activity which bordered on restlessness, his magnificence, which struggled, sometimes to his humiliation, with his scanty means, had cast an unwonted and imposing grandeur, which might recall the great days of the Othos, the Henrys, the Fredericks, around the Imperial throne.

But nothing so raised and confirmed the influence of Sigismund, as his avowed and steadfast resolution to terminate the Schism in the Church, and to compel

the reformation of the clergy so imperiously demanded by all Christendom. This could be accomplished only by a General Council, a council of greater authority and more fully representing all the kingdoms and the whole hierarchy of Christendom than that of Pisa.

John XXIII. could not but know that the price of the alliance of Sigismund, now his only refuge, was the summoning a General Council. His own title rested on the authority of that of Pisa. The Council of Pisa had decreed that the same or another Council should meet after three years. If such Council were but a continuation of that of Pisa, he was the only Pope whom it could recognize; if summoned in his name, its obedience to that summons was an acknowledgment of his lawful authority. However dangerous so grave and solemn an assembly to a Pope whose election was by no means absolutely above the suspicion of force, bribery, or treachery; still more to a Pope burdened by the consciousness of a life so utterly unpapal: yet his confidence in his own subtlety and skill in intrigue; the authority of his position as actual and acknowledged Pontiff; the strong Italian interest which would rally round an Italian Pope; the great wealth, however obtained, at his command; the gratitude, if such virtue were known, of many Cardinals of high name for learning and virtue, whom he had promoted to that dignity; his power of impeding, protracting, postponing, perplexing, averting embarrassing questions; his personal presidency; a thousand fortuitous circumstances might mitigate the unavoidable danger, and enable him to involve in inextricable disputes a divided assembly: and what Council was ever without such divisions?

The Pope therefore determined to submit with a good grace to the inevitable Council. His ambassadors to the Emperor had full power to cede this momentous point.¹ To his secretary, Leonardo Aretino, he betrayed his secret policy. "All depends on the place appointed for the Council: I will not trust myself within the dominions of the Emperor. My ambassadors, for the sake of appearances, shall have liberal instructions, and the fullest powers to display in public: in private I will limit them to certain cities."² These cities he named, and adhered for some days to his resolution. But on the day on which those ambassadors, the Cardinal Challant, and Zabarella Cardinal of Florence, took leave, he seemed seized with a sudden access of courage and confidence. He had intended to restrict their powers, yet he had such reliance on their discretion, that he tore in pieces their secret instructions and threw them aside.

The interview between the Emperor and the Cardinals took place at Como. Whether the Cardinals deliberately preferred the interests of Christendom to the interests of the Pope, or were overawed or persuaded by the Emperor, the Pope was thunderstruck when he heard that in his name they had agreed on Constance, an Imperial city on the German side of the Alps.

Constance, but that it was an Imperial city, was admirably adapted for the seat of a Council — at the

¹ See summons to Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin to the Council. Pope John carefully asserts the *Presidency* of Alexander V. in the Council of Pisa. The Council of Rome, he acknowledged, was too thinly attended. The place of the Council was not named. MS., B. M., March 3, 1413. In another document it is said, "in loco decenti et ydoneo." Rome, May 15.

² Leonard. Aretin. apud Muratori, S. R. I. Raynald, sub. ann. 1413.

foot of the Alps, accessible from Italy and from all parts of the world, with its spacious lake, from whose shores provisions might be furnished, with a salubrious air, and a well-ordered population. The Pope was perplexed to find ostensible objections; his true ones he dared not avow. He had recourse to a personal conference with the Emperor, to try how far, by his blandishments or subtile arguments, he might move the stubborn German. They met at Lodi, with ostentatious display of mutual respect. The Pope celebrated Mass in his most magnificent attire; the Emperor condescended to officiate as deacon. But if the Emperor took the lower office in ecclesiastical rank, he made the Pope feel his superior moral dignity. He gravely admonished the Pope to amend his own irregular life, to correct the notorious simony of his court. The Pope was too politic to take offence. The Emperor and the Pontiff went together in seeming amity to Cremona. There an incident had nearly taken place, which, by preventing the Council of Constance, might have changed the fortunes of the world. Gabrino Fondoli from Podestà had become tyrant of Cremona. He entertained his distinguished guests with Nov. 1413. sumptuous hospitality. He led them up a lofty tower to survey the rich and spacious plains of Lombardy. On his death-bed Fondoli confessed the sin of which he deeply repented, that he resisted the temptation, and had not hurled Pope and Emperor down, and so secured himself an immortal name.¹

The irrevocable step was now taken: John had wasted his arts, his eloquence, on the impassive Sigismund. The Imperial letters and the Papal Bull were

¹ Muratori, Ann. sub ann. 1413, with his authorities.

almost simultaneously issued to summon the General Council of Christendom to meet at Constance towards the close of the ensuing year. The Imperial edict addressed to all Christendom cited all whom it might concern to the Council at Constance. Sigismund declared his own intention to be present; he guaranteed his full protection as Emperor, to all who should attend the Council. To the Pope and to the Cardinals he guaranteed all their ecclesiastical privileges, their immunities to all prelates and clerks, to the Pope his plenary authority, jurisdiction, and power. At the same time he summoned Gregory XII., not as by name Pope, under the assurance of a full safe-conduct. Benedict XIII. was summoned through the King of Arragon.¹

The Pope having passed some months at Mantua, About Easter, 1414. under the protection of the Marquis Gonzaga, withdrew to Bologna. He had not calculated on his unlooked-for deliverance from his most dangerous and implacable foe. Ladislaus of Naples was master of Romagna almost to the gates of Bologna, and Bologna was awaiting every month an attack from his irresistible arms. He had compelled a hollow, unwilling treaty with Florence. But Ladislaus Death of Ladislaus. Aug. 6, 1414. was suddenly seized at Perugia with a mortal malady, the effect of his immoderate debaucheries. He was conveyed in a litter to Rome, thence by sea to Naples, and died.²

¹ Cæsar. Sigismund. Edictum Universale, Von der Hardt, vi. p. 5, *et seq.* Raynald. sub ann. 1413. L'Enfant, 191. It is dated Oct. 30. The Pope's Brief, Dec. 1413.

² Antonius Petri (p. 1045) of the death of Ladislaus: "De quâ novâ tota Roma videlicet pro majori parte gavisa est." Afterwards: "Obiit de unâ morte in litore maris dominus Rex Venceslaus, cujus anima *beneficatur per contrarium*" — a delicate phrase for damnation — "quia multa mala ope-

The Pope might breathe freely. He had time, short time indeed, to repent of the haste and precipitancy with which he had committed himself (was he irretrievably committed?) to the dangerous, if not fatal Council. His kindred gathered round him, the friends of his power and fortune, if not of his person. They urged the grave, ominous admonition, "You may set forth as Pope to the Council, return a private man." But the Cardinals — and it is among the inexplicable problems of his life, that some of the Cardinals whom he promoted were men of profound piety, as well as learning and character — if less true to his interests, were more faithful to his honor and truth. They pressed on him, that he was solemnly pledged to the Emperor — to Christendom: there was no retreat. Their urgency might seem a guarantee for their loyalty.¹ If they counselled his departure, they were under a strong obligation to adhere to his cause: they could not in honor, or in regard to Italian interests, forsake him. In all councils, according to the ordinary form of suffrage, the Pope and the Cardinals had maintained commanding authority. So with heavy heart, with dark and ominous misgivings, but, on the other hand, in impressive pomp and with a treasure of vast magnitude, hoarded for this end, a treasure in itself the best security for the fidelity of his adherents, John XXIII. set forth from Oct. 1, 1414. the gates of Bologna to open the Council of Constance.

ratus fuit in hoc mundo, specialiter in totâ Româ ac etiam in Ecclesia Urbis, videlicet in Ecclesiâ St. Petri et ejus Burgo, ut apparet." Neither party respected the churches. Orsini's troops with their horses were stabled in St. Paolo fuori delle mura.

¹ Raynaldus et Bzovius, sub ann. 1414.

CHAPTER VI.

WYCLIFFE.

DURING the secession of the Popes for seventy years to Avignon, and the Schism which ensued on their return to Italy, not only grew up the strong league of the hierarchy against the autocracy of the Pope, which had already in the Council of Pisa asserted, and in that of Constance was about to assume, a power superior to the Supreme Pontiff, with the right of deposing him, and reforming the Church in its Head as well as its members: in England also had appeared the first powerful adversary of the whole hierarchical system, and sowed deep in the popular mind thoughts, opinions, passions, which eventually led to the emancipation of mankind from sacerdotal and from Latin Christianity. The first teacher who shook with any lasting effect the dominion of the hierarchy — the harbinger, at least, if not the first apostle of Teutonic Christianity — was John Wycliffe.

The Teutonic constitution of England had slowly and steadily developed itself, encroaching at once on the Norman despotism of the Crown, and the Latin despotism of the Church. The privileges of the Clergy had fallen away, had been annulled or sunk into desuetude, without resistance, with sullen but unregarded remonstrance.

Teutonic
England.

The immunity of the whole order from the civil courts, and from the royal jurisdiction — their absolute right of being judged in all causes ^{Immunity of clergy from civil courts.} and for all crimes in the first instance, and therefore exclusively, in their own courts — that immunity for which Becket had begun his quarrel, lived in exile and died a martyr — had been abandoned in its extreme extent, or surrendered with no violent struggle. The strong hand of the law would no longer scruple to arrest and put on his trial a priest accused of treason, murder, or other felony. Some sanctity still adhered to his person: but his property was confiscated to the Crown, though himself might be delivered up to the Ordinary. The singular plea, the Benefit of Clergy lingered till recent times in our law, a feeble memorial of the times when no one dared lay unconsecrated hands on the “anointed of the Lord.”¹ But even archbishops appear before long in rude but vain encounter with the civil courts, in exile without public sympathy, one laying his head on the block for treason.²

¹ See b. xii. c. viii.

² There is in Wilkins a curious instrument of Archbishop Langham (Primate, 1367). He complained in Parliament that the civil authorities had not scrupled to arrest, indict, even to condemn to public execution (*morti turpissimæ et insolitæ condemnare*), clerks and regulars in holy orders. The King and the magistrates, on the other side, complained that when such persons, so found guilty of the most flagitious crimes (such cases seem to have been very common), were given up on demand to their Bishops, they were negligently guarded, and so pampered in prison, that it was a place of comfort and enjoyment rather than of penance (*quod carcer pro eorum flagitio non cedit ad pœnam, sed magis ad solatium et refocillationem suorum corporum*). Some were allowed to escape, some discharged on slight evidence. They returned to their old courses, and were of bad example to unoffending clergymen. The primate orders that the prisoners be kept more strictly; these notorious malefactors and felons watched more closely and kept to hard diet. — Wilkins, iii. pp. 13, 14. In another docu-

The second absolute immunity, from taxation, had been wrested from the Clergy, notwithstanding the obstinate and passionate resistance of Boniface VIII., by the vigor of Edward I. The Clergy who would not respect the king's law, being put out of the protection of the law, had found their old defence against the Crown, spiritual censures, so unavailing, the superstitious terror, or the grateful reverence of the people, so utterly gone, that they were compelled to yield.¹ They now hardly asserted more than their right to tax themselves for secular purposes in their separate House of Parliament, the Convocation, and to grant, assess, and levy the subsidies which they dared no longer to refuse.

Under the reign of the feeble Edward II. there is some resumption of the Papal power. We have heard Clement V. command the arrestation and persecution of the Templars: he was obeyed not without some reluctance, but obeyed. The avaricious John XXII. would not abandon the claims of the See of Rome on the yet wealthy, not yet exhausted land. The mediation of Pope John between England and Scotland was accepted with the eager willingness of conscious weakness by Edward II., in his conscious strength sullenly, coldly submitted to by Robert Bruce.² Bruce laughed to scorn the Pope's excommunication.³

ment it is complained that priests and secular clerks are persons "*pendus par agard des justices seculiers, en prejudice des franchises.*" King and Parliament grant benefit of clergy. In another, many clerks are found guilty of forging the King's coin. — P. 28.

¹ See vol. vi. p. 259.

² See the apology of Pope John to Edward for addressing Robert Bruce by the title of King, without which Bruce would not receive his letters. — MS., B. M. Oct. 21, 1316; March 29, 1317.

³ The Pope's Nuncios were waylaid and plundered near Durham by

But Pope John would not espouse the cause of England without his reward. He peremptorily demanded the full arrears of the tribute of 1000 marks, fallen behind under Edward I.; still more under Edward II., whose poverty, not his courage, resisted the Papal requisitions. The Pope recites the surrender of the island by King John. King Edward is admonished that the neglect is offensive to God, that on this payment depends his salvation.¹ In a letter to the Primate all the disasters of the land are traced to the sacrilegious withholding of the 1000 marks.² The Pope indeed gave good counsel to the young king.³ He took his part, even by excommunication and interdict against the Barons, but at the same time warned him against his foolish and criminal favoritism.⁴ Throughout the frequent correspondence appears the shrewd worldly wisdom of Pope John, too sagacious not to see and despise the weakness of the King; yet John is on the King's side, in order to secure the tribute of the land, the Peter's Pence, and other convenient emoluments of the See of Rome. He does not refuse to the King grants of subsidies from Church property.⁵

partisans of Bruce. The monks of Durham were concerned in this. It is a curious passage. — MS., B. M., vol. xvi., dated Avignon, April 28.

¹ "Et quorum præstatio divinam tibi gratiam poterit sequestrare." — Ad Reg. Edward. Sept. 18, 1317.

² Ad Episcop. Cantuaren.

³ See the curious letter of advice, "cum juvenibus et imprudentibus tractas negotia ac consilium maturitatis abjiciens per viam Roboam, consilia (o?) juvenum incedis. Totius bona regni tui immoderatè distribuis." — Oct. 21, 1317. Compare p. 510: "Bona tua a garsionibus et gulosis hominibus aut aliis personis turpibus consumi contingunt."

⁴ In 1322, Jan. 19, he exhorts Edward to peace with the Barons; he had not kept faith as to the sentence against the Despencers. — P. 431.

⁵ There is one strange story, characteristic of the times and the men. Edward II., besides his ambassador, the Bishop of Hereford, sent a Franciscan friar to communicate most privately to the Pope ("nobis solis,"

The wars of England and France under Edward III. had found the Pope no longer, even in theory, as of old, the impartial and independent Pontiff of Christendom, residing in his own capital, lord of his own territory, usually an Italian and chosen by Italian Cardinals. He was now a Frenchman, elected by a French Conclave, almost nominated by the King of France; if not within the realm, in a city on the borders of, and surrounded by France; a vassal, in truth, and often an instrument in the hands of that King. The Pope had indeed appeared to assume a lofty neutrality, had pretended to impose his imperious mediation; and the

writes John) a divine vision, and to take the advice of his Holiness. The Virgin appeared to St. Thomas when an exile in France, foretold his martyrdom, and that the *fifth* King after Henry II. would be "vir benignus ac Ecclesiæ Dei pugil." She gave the Saint an ampulla of most holy oil. The King anointed by that oil would recover the Holy Land. St. Thomas gave the oil to a monk of the Convent of St. Cyprian in Poitiers. The same monk also received a plate with an inscription which he only could read. (The oil was as that revealed to Pope Leo, with which Archbishop Turpin anointed Charlemagne.) When the King of the Pagans heard that this oil was concealed at Poitiers, he sent a Christian and a Pagan to get it. The Pagan died; the Christian bought it with the Pagan's money, and carried it to Germany, where it came into the possession of the Duke of Brabant. Edward might have been anointed with it at his coronation through his kinsman the Duke of Brabant, but, content with his usual anointing, had refused. Its virtue had now been proved by a miracle wrought on the Duchess of Brabant. Edward now gravely attributes all his misfortunes to his refusal of this oil. Still he would not be a second time anointed without the sanction of the Pope. Pope John treats the matter with solemn seriousness. He consults with a Cardinal. He decides that as "no observation of days or hours is enjoined," it is not superstitious to believe in the oil; it would not interfere with the former unction. The Pope, however, refuses to authorize any prelate to do it: the King may get it done, but secretly (*clam*), for fear of raising too much astonishment. The Pope in conclusion suddenly turns round, and wisely says "that a virtuous life will be more efficacious: it will be of more real value to the King to protect the Church of Rome and her liberties" — the Papal notion of virtue! All this is from the Pope's own letter. — MS., B. M., June 2, 1318.

weaker the King of France had become by his humiliating defeats, the less servile became the Pope. Yet this neutrality, though not violated, was held in just suspicion by England; the mediation was hardly so far respected as to be declined. The conqueror of Crecy and of Poitiers was not likely to submit to the arbitration of a French Pope. More than once, it has been seen, the victorious bands of the Black Prince approached, alarmed, if they did not threaten, Avignon. The splendid palaces of the Cardinals at Villeneuve, on the right bank of the Rhone, might at any time fall a defenceless prey to the Gascon marauders.

In England the war had become popular, national.¹ The clergy did not dare or did not desire to withhold their contributions; but the heavier taxation of the Crown made them more impatient of the taxation of the See of Rome by first-fruits, annates, reservations, and direct burdens, carried to an unprecedented height by the need or the avarice of the Avignonese Pontiffs;²

¹ The Cardinal Legates, in 1346, about June, instead of being received with honor, were received "*plerumque conviciis, contemptibus, et injuriis*;" they are in peril of being "*pro bono opere lapidati*." The Pope instructs them not to expose themselves to danger, to have guards against popular riot, to take care that everything is written. — MS., B. M., Aug. 28, vol. xxii. p. 194.

² In MS., B. M. Clement VI. complains to Queen Isabella and Queen Philippa, and to the King's Council (Aug. 28, 1343), that certain proctors of his Cardinals, in England on business, had been ignominiously expelled the realm. He claims (July 7, 1344) reserves of all vacant benefices for two years, on account of the poverty of the Roman See (vol. xxi. p. 190). He writes to the King complaining of Acts of Parliament against Reservations and Provisions. He asserts himself "*ecclesiarum omnium tanquam Pastor Universalis*." The King's interference is impious. The Acts are "*in derogationem et enervationem prædictæ libertatis ecclesiasticæ, Primatus ejusdem Romanæ ecclesiæ et auctoritatis et potestatis ipsius sedis Apostolicæ*." Persons had been sacrilegiously imprisoned for disobedience to these Acts. He threatens divine vengeance. Jan. 30, 1345. Clement protests that he had not sent his Legates to fulminate censures or excom-

and they had been almost entirely alienated from Rome by their hostility to the foreign prelates intruded into the richest benefices of the kingdom.¹ Throughout this long reign England was becoming less hierarchical, the hierarchy more English.

Nothing shows more clearly the change in the national opinion and in the times than the relation of the King and the Primate of the realm. One Archbishop of Canterbury, Stratford, a few years after Edward III.'s accession,² is arraigned of high treason; he declares himself in danger of capital punishment, though the King disclaims such intention. The crime of which the Primate is, probably without justice, accused, is a secular offence—the malversation of subsidies levied for the French war. The Archbishop flies from Lambeth (two other bishops, Lichfield and Chichester, the King's treasurers, had been sent to the Tower). At Canterbury he ventures to excommunicate his accusers, the King's counsellors,

munications: they were only sent peaceably to endeavor to persuade the King to give up the obnoxious statutes (p. 472). The Bishopric of Ely is a reservation. Thomas de Insulâ, penitentiarius noster, but (oriundus) of English race, *recommended* to the King.

¹ The King had taken, or borrowed "sub obligatione congruâ," all the "proventus et redditus" of benefices held by foreigners (*alienigenas*) for the support and necessities of the realm, deducting the burdens on them. The Pope (Clement) wonders at his audacity. It was not by the advice of "periti," but "imperiti," that he occupied "bona Ecclesiastica, in quibus, sicut nosti, nulla laicis est attributa potestas." The "color quæsitus credita non excusat." Let the King's counsellors observe "quod multi ex fratribus nostris Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalibus in Regno tuo prædicto beneficia obtinentes, qui circa nos universali Ecclesiæ serviendo singularum Ecclesiarum commoditatibus utiliter se impendunt." Those not resident in "obsequio nostro," or for other just causes, were to be considered resident. Clement entreats the King, for the good of his soul to give up his sacrilegious design. April 24, 1346. Compare letter, April 28, 1347.

² Stratford, Archbishop, 1333. Edward III., VIII.

with bell, book, and candle. He returns to London, but shrouds himself under the privileges of Parliament rather than under his ecclesiastical immunity. He forces his way, himself bearing his cross, into the House of Peers, as his place of security, his one safe sanctuary. He is at last obliged to submit, ere he can be admitted to compurgation, to an investigation before a jury of twelve of his peers—four prelates and eight nobles. The quarrel is settled by amicable intervention, but the King grants rather than condescends to accept pardon.¹ This arraignment of Becket's successor without a general insurrection of the Church, with no Papal remonstrance, though Stratford himself held the loftiest doctrines on the superiority of the priest to the layman, is an ominous sign. A second Primate, Simon Langham, having accepted a Cardinal's hat, lives in exile. A third (under Richard II.), Simon Sudbury, is cruelly murdered by the peasants of Kent; yet the land is darkened with no interdict; the martyr is canonized neither by the fear of the people nor the reverence of the clergy. A fourth, Arundel, is arraigned of high treason, sees his brother the Earl of Arundel executed before his face for a conspiracy in which himself is concerned, flees for safety to the continent, returns only under the protection of Henry Bolingbroke. That usurper (Henry IV.) hesitates not to strike off the head of the Archbishop of York for capital treason; and so sunken is the Pope through the Schism, that there is but a feeble shadow of remonstrance at this sacrilegious violation of the canon law. He vindicates the conduct of the King with an elab-

¹ Godwin de Præsulibus. Vit. Stratford.

orate apology, and hastens to bestow his absolution on all concerned in the execution.¹

It was not indeed till the reign of Richard II. that the three great limitary Statutes — of Mortmain, of Provisors, and of Præmunire (the two first less stringently enacted before) took their perfect form — together the Great Charter, as it were, of English liberties against the Church. One had risen above the other. The first, Mortmain, set an impassable bound to the all-absorbing acquisitions of the Church, and the severance of the land into one sacred and one common territory — the sacred slowly encroaching till it threatened to swallow up the other.² The second, Provisors, wrested away the Papal power of disposing at least of all the benefices in the patronage of spiritual persons.³ The third, Præmunire, boldly and openly vindicated the right of the State of England to prohibit the admission or the execution of all Papal Bulls or Briefs within the realm, a virtual prophetic, premonitory declaration of the King's supremacy.⁴

¹ See MS., B. M. Gregory XI. to the Bishops of Durham and Lincoln. He dwells on the undoubted treason of Scrope, by which his life was forfeited to the laws of the land, "*licet Archiepiscopus præfatus deliquerit, correctio tamen et punitio secundum canonum instituta ecclesiastico judici fuerit relinquenda.*" Yet the danger to the King and the urgency of his friends, fully justify the act. The interdict issued by the more virtuous and bolder Innocent VII. is annulled; all processes declared void; the Bishops have plenary authority to reconcile every one who had any hand in the affair. — Lucca, April 13, 1408.

² Compare on the successive statutes and final law of Mortmain, Blackstone, c. 18.

³ On Provisors, consult a book of greater merit than fame, "*England under the House of Lancaster*" (London, 1852), p. 396. The abandonment of those in lay patronage was a prudent concession of the Pope. See Lingard, vol. iii. p. 108.

⁴ On Præmunire, 16 Richd. II. c. 5. Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii. p. 48.

About three years¹ before the accession of Edward III., was born of humble parentage in a village near Richmond in Yorkshire, John Wycliffe, who was to give lasting celebrity to the name of his obscure birthplace.² His destination, either from his own choice or the wise providence of his parents, was that of a scholar, to which the humblest could in those days aspire. England was almost a land of schools; every Cathedral, almost every Monastery, had its own; but youths of more ambition, self-confidence, supposed capacity, and of better opportunities, thronged to Oxford and Cambridge, now in their highest repute. In England, as throughout Christendom, that wonderful rush, as it were, of a vast part of the population towards knowledge, thronged the Universities with thousands of students, instead of the few hundreds who have now the privilege of entering those seats of instruction. This silent, regular, peaceful, and as yet inexhaustible crusade for the conquest of University learning, for the worship of the Schoolmen and the Doctors, for the adoration of the relics of ancient religious and even philosophical wisdom, for the discovery of the Aristotelian or Arabian Dialectics, arose in great degree out of the state of society. There were in truth but two professions, Arms and the Church. But Arms—though the English yeomen, her archers, crossbow-men, and bill-men had now begun to make their importance felt in the continental wars—was, as to distinction at least, an aristocratic profession. The demand for foot-soldiers, though on the increase, was limited and precarious. They were mostly raised

Birth of
Wycliffe.

Movement
to the Uni-
versities.

¹ 1324-1327.

² This seems clearly proved by Lewis and Vaughan, the biographers of Wycliffe.

for a short and hasty campaign, and dismissed again by their suzerain. The regular troops, and even the Free Bands, formed but a small part of the population. But the Church was constantly needing, constantly drawing from all quarters, recruits for her service; and that not only for her own special functions, most lawyers, physicians, even statesmen, were ecclesiastics. The Monastic establishments, the Friars in their various Orders, absorbed undiminished multitudes. The Church had no succession in herself. Not that married clergy were unknown or infrequent, or that the canonical proscription could exclude the sons of the clergy, though held illegitimate, from holy orders, or the inheritance of patrimonial benefices.¹ Still these were few in proportion to the inexhaustible demand. The vast mass of the secular clergy, all those in the inferior Orders (the noble, even royal, families furnished some prelates and rich beneficiaries) as well as the Monks and Friars, came from below. It was the great strength, as among the great blessings of the hierarchy, that the meanest might themselves aspire to be, or might see their kindred, become the most learned, wealthy, powerful in the realm — Bishops, Chancellors, Archbishops, Cardinals, even Popes.

John Wycliffe found his way to Oxford; he was admitted into Queen's College, then just founded by Philippa of Hainault, Queen of Edward III. He removed to Merton, the older, wealthier, and more famous of the Oxford foundations.

The English Universities had already begun to take their peculiar character, a league, as it were, of separate, independent Colleges, each a distinct republic, with its endowments, statutes, internal government;

¹ Compare vol. vi. p. 298.

though the University was still paramount, and the Chancellor, with his inferior officers, held the supreme, all-embracing authority. These colleges were founded for the maintenance of poor scholars by Statesmen, Prelates, Princes, Kings, Queens. There were now six of these colleges in Oxford, as distinguished from the halls or hostels, where the other scholars dwelt and studied only under the ordinary academic discipline.¹ Walter de Merton, Chancellor of Henry III., was the founder of that noble institution. De Merton, though he introduced, according to the habits of his time, much of the monastic discipline, the common diet, seclusion within the walls, regular service and study: perhaps as a churchman, possibly with even more widely-prophetic view, was singularly jealous lest his college should degenerate into a narrow monastic community. Whoever became a monk was expelled from his fellowship. Merton, among her older students, might offer famous names to excite the pride and emulation of her scholars. She boasted the venerable tradition of Duns Scotus, the rival of the most renowned of the Schoolmen, of Aquinas himself. Roger Bacon probably was an object as much of awe as of admiration, as little comprehended by Wycliffe as by the most supercilious churchman or narrow-minded monk. But if only the name of William of Ockham, the Locke of the Middle Ages in his common sense philosophy, and in the single-minded worship of truth, were held in reverence; if his works ^{Famous men of Merton.} were studied, it could be no wonder if the scholars of Merton indulged in speculations perilous to the Pope,

¹ All this has been well wrought out in the Report of the Oxford University Commission. See also the Histories of Oxford.

to the hierarchy, even to the imaginative creed of the Middle Ages. The bold and rigid nominalism of Ockham struck at the root of all the mystic allegoric theology; it endangered some of the Church doctrines. His high imperialist Apologies shattered the foundations of the Papal Supremacy, and reduced the hierarchy below the Throne. The last renowned teacher of divinity at Merton had been the profound Bradwardine, whose great learning (he was celebrated as a geometer as well as a theologian), his lowliness, and admirable piety, had made a strong impression on his age. He had just lived to be Archbishop of Canterbury.¹ Bradwardine may have left his influence on the mind of Wycliffe in his severe Augustinian Predestinarianism, a doctrine in which the more austere churchmen and all the first Reformers (or they would hardly have dared to be Reformers) met as to its theory, if not its application.

Wycliffe's fame in Oxford, his promotion to offices of high trust and honor, and his writings, are the only testimonies to the extent and depth of his academic studies; his logic, his scholastic subtilty, some rhetorical art, his power of reading the Latin Scriptures, his various erudition, may be due to Oxford; but the vigor and energy of his genius, his perspicacity, the force of his language, his mastery over the vernacular English, the high supremacy which he vindicated for the Scriptures, which by immense toil he promulgated in the vulgar tongue — these were his own, to be learned in no school, to be attained by none of the ordinary courses of study. As with his contemporary

¹ Collier, i. 552. Godwin de Præsulibus. Bradwardine survived his consecration only five weeks and four days.

and most congenial spirit, Chaucer, rose English Poetry, in its strong homely breadth and humor, in the wonderful delineation of character with its finest shades, in its plain, manly good sense and kindly feeling (some of its richness and fancifulness it might owe to Italy and France): so was Wycliffe the Father of English Prose, rude but idiomatic, biblical in much of its picturesque phraseology, at once highly colored by and coloring the Translation of the Scriptures.

Great obscurity hangs over the earliest publications of Wycliffe, obscurity further darkened by the publication of the tract called "The Last Age of the Church."¹ If this be genuine, Wycliffe must have been in danger of sinking into a wild follower of the Fraticelli, the believers in the visions of the Abbot Joachim. A profoundly religious mind like Wycliffe's may have brooded over the awful plague which a few years before had devastated Europe,² and might be accepted as a sign of the Last Days by devout men. The treatise may have been composed at that period, or the darkness then impressed upon his mind may have dispersed but slowly. The denunciations of the Tract are against the Clergy, the Simonians, and holders of great benefices;³ no word against his future enemies, the Mendicants.

¹ We are indebted for this publication, from the library of Trinity College, to the learned Dr. Todd of Dublin. Dr. Todd appears to me more completely sceptical as to its authenticity than he admits himself to be. The only authority for its genuineness is, that it appears in a volume which contains other tracts by Wycliffe; and that a Tract under this name is recounted among his works by the inaccurate Bishop Bale, and on his authority received by Lewis, who had not seen it.

² A.D. 1347-8-9. Ann. ætat. Wycliffe, 23-4-5.

³ Both vengeance of swerde and myschiefe unknown before, by which man thes daise should be punished, shall fall for synne of prestis, &c., &c. — p. xxxiv.

It was by his fearless and unsparing attack on the Mendicant Friars that Wycliffe rose into fame, honor, and popularity at Oxford. The Mendicants in England, as everywhere else (now four Orders), had swarmed in their irresistible numbers. Here, too, they had invaded every stronghold of the clergy, the University, the city, the village parish. Here, too, the Clergy clamored, and with unrelaxing clamor, that these intruders entered into their cures, withdrew their flocks from the discipline of the Church, intercepted the offerings, estranged their affections, heard confessions with more indulgent ears, granted absolution on easier terms. Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, who before his Irish Primacy had been Chancellor of Oxford, a man of high character, had denounced them as utterly destructive of true religion. The Mendicants strove hard in Oxford, as heretofore in Paris and all the other Universities, to obtain the ascendancy, either from their ambition, their conscious pride in their great theologians, or as foreseeing the brooding rebellion of more free inquiry and a bolder speculative philosophy, which themselves had unknowingly fostered by some of their sons. They were accused of trepanning the youth who were sent up to the Universities.¹ Parents were afraid to risk their sons, who without their consent were enlisted into the Mendicant Orders. The number of scholars is said to have sunk from 30,000 to 6000. The Friars were at the same time ambitious of the honors of the University. They claimed degrees on their own terms, and demanded that the

¹ The University, the Chancellor and Regents, passed a Statute, that none should be received into the Orders of the Friars under fifteen years old. Lewis, p. 5, 6.

Statutes of the University which limited the age at which youths might become Friars should yield to their own.¹ Appeal was made to Rome. Urban V. condemned the Statutes in the strongest terms. Cambridge was equally guilty with Oxford in vigorous resistance to all encroachments on the University. And it appears not that the Universities obeyed the mandate to repeal their Statutes.²

Wycliffe struck boldly at the root of the evil: he denounced Mendicancy in itself. He denied, with vigor of argument which might have won the favor of John XXII., that Christ was a Mendicant; he dwelt on their blasphemy in likening their institutes to the Gospel, their founder to the Saviour. He treated all the Orders and both the classes among the Franciscans with the same asperity. He branded the higher as hypocrites, who, professing mendicancy, had stately houses, rode on noble horses, had all the pride and luxury of wealth with the ostentation of poverty. The humbler he denounced with all his indignation as common able-bodied beggars, who ought not to be permitted to infest the land.³

¹ Ibid.

² MS., B. M. The Pope Urban V. declares that the statute "*canonicis obviat institutis*." The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops are to order the Chancellor, *summarie et de plano, ac sine strepitu et figurâ iudicii*, to repeal the statute, and this without appeal, June 1, 1365. The second letter condemns Cambridge as Oxford. The regulations are "*dilectioni Dei dissona, proximis noxia et sacris traditionibus inimica*." The Archbishop, the Bishops of Llandaff (London?) and Bangor, are to cite the Universities to show cause why they have enacted such statutes. In the mean time the Pope suspends their execution. July 19, 1365.

³ The opinions of the austerer Franciscans that Christ and his Apostles were absolutely without property had been publicly taught in London by Roger Conway, a Minorite; opposed by Richard Kilmyngton, Dean of St. Paul's, and by Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, who was born in London.

So far Wycliffe was the champion of a great party in the University and in the Church. Hon-
1361-1365.
Preferments.
Canterbury
Hall. ors, dignities crowded upon him. He was
 Warden of Baliol Hall, on the presentation
 of Baliol College,¹ Rector of Fylingham, Warden of
 Canterbury Hall. His last appointment plunged Wyc-
 liffe into litigation, and into an appeal to the Court of
 Rome.

Simon Islip, Archbishop of Canterbury, had en-
 deavored in his foundation of Canterbury Hall to
 blend together the Monastic and Secular Clergy. Of
 twelve fellows the Warden and three were monks from
 Christ Church in Canterbury, eight secular Clergy.
 The Hall was endowed with the Rectory of Pagenham
 in Sussex, and a manor, Wingford, in Northampton-
 shire. One Wodehull was named Warden. Wode-
 hull is described as a turbulent and violent man : ² the
 scheme of amicable union broke up. Just before his
 death Islip dispossessed Wodehull and the monks ; the
 Hall was surrendered altogether to the Seculars ; Wyc-
 liffe was named Warden. Simon Langham became
 Archbishop ; Langham was a monk by education and
 character.³ It was alleged that the act of his pre-
 decessor Islip was extorted from him in a state of
 imbecility. Langham annulled the proceeding, and

In Oxford they were preached in 1360, opposed by Wycliffe, Thoresby
 Archbishop of York and others.

¹ Doubt has been thrown on his Baliol preferment by Mr. Courthope.
 See England under Henry of Lancaster, note iv. p. 356.

² Wodehull was unpopular in the University ; it was with great difficulty
 that he was admitted to his degree. — Lewis.

³ Simon Langham was hated by a large party in the Church, as appears
 from the well-known verses —

Exultant cœli quia Simon venit ab Ely
 Cujus ad adventum fient in Kent millia centum.

reinstated Wodehull; Wycliffe resisted; the Archbishop endeavored to compel submission by the sequestration of the Pagenham Rectory; Wycliffe appealed to the Pope. This was his only resource; it implies no confidence in the justice of the Papal Court; it is consistent with serious misgivings as to his own chance of obtaining impartial justice; it was but the common order of things.

Wycliffe's fame was not confined to Oxford; his opinion was demanded by the Crown on a subject of grave importance. The Pope Urban V. had been so unwise at this juncture as to demand the arrears of the 1000 marks, of which so much has been heard, the tribute and acknowledgment of fealty to the Roman See. That ignominious burden had now been allowed to accumulate for thirty-three years. Urban was urged to the demand by his poverty, covetousness, or desire of embarrassing King Edward. Wycliffe was commanded to answer some bold Doctor who maintained the right of the Pope. As royal chaplain he was present at a solemn debate in the King's Council; he recites the opinions delivered by seven of the barons, singularly curious and characteristic. To these Wycliffe, as a humble and obedient son of the Roman Church, protesting that he held nothing injurious to that Church or offensive to pious ears, refers his own adversary before he begins his argument. The first was a frank, warlike Peer, of few, plain words:—"Our ancestors won this realm and held it against all foes by the sword. Julius Cæsar exacted tribute by force; force gives no perpetual right. Let the Pope come and take it by force; I am ready to stand up and resist him." The second was more argumentative:—

“The Pope is incapable of such feudal supremacy. He should follow the example of Christ, who refused all civil dominion ; the foxes have holes, and the birds of the air their nest, he had not where to lay his head. Let us rigidly hold the Pope to his spiritual duties, boldly oppose all his claims to civil power.” The third said : — “The Pope calls himself the Servant of the Servants of the Most High ; his only claim to tribute from this realm is for some service done ; but what is his service to this realm ? Not spiritual edification, but draining away money to enrich himself and his Court, showing favor and counsel to our enemies.” The fourth : — “The Pope claims to be the suzerain of all estates held by the Church ; these estates held in mortmain amount to one third of the realm. There cannot be two suzerains ; the Pope, therefore, for these estates, is the King’s vassal ; he has not done homage for them ; he may have incurred forfeiture.” The fifth was more subtle : — “If the Pope demands this money as the price of King John’s absolution, it is flagrant simony : it is an irreligious act to say, ‘I will absolve you on payment of a certain annual tribute ;’ but the King pays not this tax ; it is wrung from the poor of the realm ; to exact it is an act of avarice rather than salutary punishment. If the Pope be lord of the realm, he may at any time declare it forfeited, and grant away the forfeiture.” The sixth was even more vigorous in his retort : — “If the realm be the Pope’s, what right had he to alienate it ? He has fraudulently sold it for not a fifth part of its value. Moreover, Christ alone is the suzerain ; the Pope being fallible may be in mortal sin. It is better, as of old, to hold the realm immediately of Christ.” The seventh boldly denied the right

of John to surrender the realm:—"He could not grant it away in his folly; the whole, the Royal Charter, signature, seal, is an absolute nullity." Wycliffe in his own resolute vindication of resistance to the Pope's claim had alluded to the peril which himself incurred lest he should be defamed at the court of Rome, and incur ecclesiastical censure and loss of benefices.¹ It cannot be known how far this act or the character of Wycliffe influenced the decision of the Court of Rome in his appeal; but after some delay Canterbury Hall was adjudged to the monks of Christ Church; Wodehull was again appointed Master.²

Just at this juncture appeared a clearer sign and an omen that the popular mind had begun to look with jealousy on the power of hierarchy.

A.D. 1371.
45 Edward
III.

In the Parliament of 1371 the Commons addressed the Crown with a remonstrance against the ap-
pointment of Churchmen to all great dignities of the State, and a petition that laymen might be chosen for those secular offices. The King answered that he would consult with his Council on the matter. The connection of Wycliffe or Wycliffe's opinions with this movement does not appear, or how far Wycliffe had as yet urged those principles which at a later time he expressed so strongly. The movement was generally attributed to John of Gaunt,—to John of Gaunt, the patron of Chaucer, the protector, as will soon appear, of Wycliffe against the hierarchy. The blow was

Parliament petition against Hierarchy.

¹ *Primo ut persona mea sic ad Romanam curiam diffamata, et aggravatis censuris ab ecclesiasticis beneficiis sit privata.* — Apud Lewis, p. 351, where the whole may be read at length.

² Richard Benger, who ought to have stood as proctor for Wycliffe, did not appear: he was declared contumacious. Judgment seems to have gone by default.

aimed principally at William of Wykeham, that magnificent Prelate, who from the surveyor and architect of the King (Windsor owes its royal splendor to King Edward), had become Bishop of Winchester, Chancellor, and at the head of all affairs of State. The blow was not without effect. Wykeham ceased to be Chancellor; the Bishop of Exeter resigned the treasurer'ship. In writings of which the date is doubtful, Wycliffe directly inveighs against this abuse: — "Neither prelates nor doctors, priests nor deacons, should hold secular offices, that is those of chancery, treasury, privy-seal, and other such temporal offices in the exchequer; neither be stewards of lands, nor stewards of the hall, nor clerks of the kitchen, nor clerks of accounts; neither be occupied in any secular office in lords' courts, more especially while secular men are sufficient to do such offices." In another passage there is a bitter and manifest allusion to Wykeham: — "Benefices, instead of being bestowed on poor clerks, are heaped on a kitchen clerk, or one wise in building castles, or in worldly business."¹

Wycliffe's position in Oxford was not lowered by his expulsion from the Wardenship of Canterbury Hall. He became Doctor, Professor of Divinity; that is, as Doctor he had the right of delivering lectures on theology. From the public chair he had full opportunity of promulgating his own views;

¹ Apud Vaughan, i. 312. See another striking passage on the incompatibility of such offices with thoughtfulness about heavenly things. *Piers Ploughman* is strong on this grievance; he says of the higher Clergy: —

Some serven the Kinge, and his selver tellen,
In the Checkkere and the Chauncelrie, challengynge his dettes,
Of Wardes and of Wardemotes, wayves and strayes.

we know not how far as yet from the intrepid antagonist of the Mendicants he had become the open adversary of the wealthier hierarchy; how far he had departed from the established creed. We know not whether Wycliffe had now advanced beyond Oxford, or Oxford advanced as far as Wycliffe. From a man of unimpeachable morals, profound devotion, undoubted sincerity, vigor, and original eloquence, much denunciation against the abuses of the time, the enormous pride, wealth, luxury, loose morals, secular pursuits of the higher Clergy, might be at once so popular and so true, that on the one hand a formidable host of partisans might form themselves around the dauntless Professor, while on the other he might give no hold for specific charges either of hostility to the Church or of heretical pravity. There was a wide field for safe freedom; his enemies in condemning Wycliffe would be pleading guilty to his charges.

The nomination of Wycliffe by the Crown as second in a commission to treat with the Papal Legate at Bruges, in the great questions at issue between the King of England and the Pope, shows his growing importance, his high esteem with some person powerful in Parliament and at Court, probably John of Gaunt, and strong confidence in his courage and ability.¹ That the Pope, a Pope of the high character and rigor of Gregory XI., should condescend to negotiations on such subjects, which he was wont to decide by fulminating censures, was in itself a sign of change. John

¹ Did Edward consider Wycliffe to come up to the Pope's description of the ambassadors? The King ought to send men "*claros scientiâ ac laudandæ virtutis, et cunctâ prudentiâ præditos, cultores justitiæ, sedulosque pacis et concordie zelatores.*" — MS., B. M., May 1, 1374.

Bishop of Bangor and two others, a Benedictine monk and a knight, appeared as Edward's ambassadors at Avignon. They complained in no measured terms of the Papal interference with royal patronage, of provisors and reservations, and the citations of the King's subjects in the Court of Rome.¹ The Pope, on his side, appealed to the notorious fact, that the Apostolic Briefs were not permitted to be published in England; that his Nuncios were not admitted to the realm, as in every other kingdom of the faithful. The meeting at Bruges was to settle those differences by amicable concession; the Pope appointed the Bishops of Pampeluna and Sinigaglia as his ambassadors.²

During these disputes between the Crown of England and the Pope throughout the reign of the Edwards, a third party had begun to intervene, and with increasing weight. The Parliament were determined and obstinate in their resistance to the burdens imposed on the kingdom and on the Clergy by the Papal Court; and they were strong, as representing the will of the nation, and sure that their resistance was not disapproved by the King. It was not perhaps the taxation of the Clergy to which they were so resolutely opposed, so much as the continual drain of specie, which was considered as the impoverishment of the realm, and was as yet but imperfectly prevented by the bills of exchange, brought into use chiefly by the

¹ The Bishop of Lincoln had been cited to Avignon to answer for impeding the collection of the Pope's subsidy from the Clergy. On this subject the Pope was forced to be bold.

² There are many papers of Instructions to the Papal Commissioners. The meeting was appointed for St. John Baptist's Day, 1374, by different adjournments postponed to Easter, 1375. It took place in July. All suits in the mean time were suspended in the Papal as in the King's courts.

Lombard and Italian bankers.¹ The old grievance, too, still offended the whole realm, the Clergy as well as the people — the possession of so many of the most wealthy benefices by foreigners, some of whom had never entered the kingdom, some but for a short time ; most were unacquainted with the language of the country. These revenues in hard money were transmitted to Rome or to Avignon, to be spent on the luxuries of Cardinals or Papal favorites. Parliament with one indignant voice declared the surrender of the realm by John null and void, as without the consent of Parliament, and contrary to the King's coronation oath. Both estates, Lords and Commons, asserted their determination to stand by the King against the usurpations of the Pope.² Parliament was as resolute against the other abuse. The first Statute of Provisors had been passed in the reign of Edward I.³ Twice already in the reign of Edward III. was this law reenacted with penalties rising one above another in severity. It was declared that the Court of Rome could present to no bishopric or benefice in England. Whoever disturbed a patron in the presentation to a living suffered fine and ransom to the King, and was imprisoned till he renounced the provision. To cite the King to appear in the Court of Rome was highly penal.⁴ Yet ten years after arose new complaints, A.D. 1373. embodied in an address of the Commons to the King on the subject of provisions and first-fruits. The King

¹ From the Papal Letters (MS., B. M.) may be gleaned many curious particulars about the agency of these bankers, Siennese and Florentines.

² 40th Edw. III. Blackstone, iv. c. 8, from Selden.

³ 35th Edw. I.

⁴ 25th Edw. III. (1351); 27th Edw. III. (1353); 38th Edw. III. (1363); Blackstone, iv. c. viii.

answered that negotiations were proceeding with the Pope for the amicable adjustment of these claims, that a commission of the Bishop of Bangor had been already sent to Gregory XI. — a Pope whose character commanded respect — in Avignon.¹ The new commission, in which Wycliffe was named, proceeded in the next year to meet the Papal Legates at Bruges.

Wycliffe was at Bruges not quite two months.² The result of the conference was reported to Avignon. If the discussion at Bruges had any effect on the course of the negotiation, nothing could be finally determined but by the Pope himself. A kind of compact was at length made, rather a suspension of arms than a definitive peace. The Pope revoked all the reservations made by Urban V., his predecessor, which had not taken effect. He confirmed the nomination of all presented by the King without first-fruits. The benefices held by the Cardi-

Wycliffe Com-
missioner at
Bruges.

A.D. 1376.

¹ The milder, it might almost be said the meek, tone of Gregory XI. singularly contrasts with that of his predecessors. The Archbishopric of York was a Papal reservation. On the vacancy the Chapter (forsoan ignam of this) elected Alexander Neville. The Pope has the judgment to cede the point, though he still asserts his right. He annuls the proceedings of the Chapter, but nominates Alexander (April 14, 1374). He presents his nephew, Adhemar de Rupe, Provost of St. Saviour's in Utrecht, to the much-coveted Archdeaconry of Canterbury as a reserve. But his letter to the King is no stern dictate; it is a prayer for the royal favor, which is most powerful in such affairs (1374). A year after he writes to the Bishop of Winchester to install his nephew (Sept. 20, 1375). There is a very curious letter addressed to William de Lucumer (qu. Lord Latimer) on the imprisonment of Roger de Beaufort and another nephew of his own, John de Rupe. He does not peremptorily order their release, but complains that they are ignominiously treated, "præter morem erga nobiles," and only implores more gentle usage in their behalf. — May, 1375.

² The accounts in the Exchequer show that Wycliffe was absent from July 27 to Sept. 14, 1375. He received 60*l.* for his expenses at 20 shillings a day: for passage 50*s.*, for re-passage 42*s.*, 3*d.* quoted in Preface to Wycliffe's Bible, Oxford, p. vii.

nals were made liable to the repairs of the Church and the buildings belonging thereunto. He quashed all the causes pending in his courts on the subject of Provisors. On his side the King remitted all the fines incurred under the three Statutes of Provisors. Thus each might seem to await better times to renew his claim. The Pope surrendered no right of future reservation or provision.¹ The prohibitory Statutes, with all their formidable penalties, remained unrepealed.²

Whatever were Wycliffe's services at Bruges, or his actions, they did not pass unrewarded. He had already exchanged the Rectory of Fylingham (in the Archdeaconry of Stowe, Diocese of Lincoln) for that of Ludgershall, nearer to Oxford. He now received from the Crown the Prebend of Aust in Worcester, and the Rectory, which he occupied till his death, of Lutterworth.

During the last two years of Edward III.'s reign, the sad and gloomy close of that reign of splendor and glory,³ there is a strange collision and confusion of religious and political interests, from which John Wycliffe emerges, now a dangerous and dreaded heresiarch. The Good Parliament is ejecting from the administration John of Gaunt, the favorer of the new opinions, and filling the council of the King with High

¹ Yet both the archbishoprics, the bishoprics, and rich abbeys continued frequently to be nominated to by the Pope. He ceased only in general to promote foreigners, *i. e.* eodem anno Papa transtulit dominum Thomas Arundel, Episc. Elien. ad Archiepiscop. Eborac. Alexandro Neville proditore et susurrone translato ad Episcop. St. Andreæ in Scotia. — Walsingham, 336.

² In the year 1390 (Rich. II. 15) the Commons extorted the renewal of the Statute of Provisors in the strongest terms.

³ "And Sorrow's faded form, and Solitude behind."

Churchmen ; at the same time it is presenting petitions against the abuse of the Papal power, such as might have been drawn by Wycliffe himself. Wycliffe is arraigned for perilous doctrines before the Bishop of London, openly protected by John of Gaunt. John of Gaunt is almost the victim of popular fury, which in a short time after appears as violently espousing the cause of Wycliffe. It may not be impossible to find the clue to guide us through this intricate labyrinth. The nation, now for the first time in the history of the constitution represented by the House of Commons, was under the influence of two strong passions. The strongest and the predominant was that of deep attachment and veneration for the Black Prince, the chivalrous hero of the French wars. The only blot on his fame was his cruelty¹ in those wars, to them no way odious. The Black Prince had led a King captive through the streets of London ; he had not only glutted the English pride with glory, he had won all hearts by his affability, his generous, gracious and noble demeanor. He was the model of perfect chivalry. The love of the Black Prince became jealousy, almost hatred, of John of Gaunt, supposed to be his rival. The Duke of Lancaster, while they were trembling with too well-grounded apprehensions for the waning life of their idol, was thought to be brooding over more sinister schemes of ambition. Their second passion was the old steady determination to emancipate the realm from the abuses of the Papal power, with some growing jealousy of the native hierarchy.

Edward III. was almost in his dotage, absolutely governed, it was believed, by John of Gaunt, by Lati-

¹ The barbarous massacre at Limoges.

mer his partisan the Lord Chancellor, and by Alice Perrers, who had not only infatuated the old man as a mistress, but was accused of having bewitched him by forbidden sorceries. Dark rumors were abroad that John of Gaunt designed to supplant the young Richard of Bordeaux on the demise of his father. So much was he hated that credence was given to a wild story (attributed, falsely no doubt, to William of Wykeham) that John of Gaunt was but a supposititious child, the son of a Flemish woman, substituted in the place of a dead daughter of the King. The Black Prince, sinking into mortal languor, seemed to rally with a father's energy to maintain the imperilled rights of his infant son. On his party were the powerful Churchmen, Courtenay Bishop of London, and Wykeham of Winchester. But the most intrepid and useful partisan was Peter de la Mare, Speaker of the House of Commons. De la Mare was steward of the Earl of March, who had married the daughter of Lionel Duke of Clarence, the second (deceased) son of Edward III. From the Earl of March sprang the House of York, hereafter to wrest the crown from the Lancastrian lineage of John of Gaunt. Parliament, for the first time led by the Commons, demanded the dismissal of the King's advisers (against whose maladministration of the realm they presented grievous complaints), and that ten or twelve Prelates and Peers should be called to the royal Council. At the head of this Council were the Churchmen, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London and Winchester. The new Council assumed its powers.¹ Latimer, John Lord Neville, Sir Richard Stafford, were ignominiously

¹ See in Lowth's *William of Wykeham* the names of the Council.

dismissed; Alice Perrers was prohibited, under pain of forfeiture and banishment, from approaching the Court. Popular sympathy denominated this Parliament "the Good Parliament." But these political measures were not their only acts. A petition was presented from which it might seem that in their view the Statutes of Provisors had been altogether inefficient. The taxes paid to the Church of Rome amounted, they averred, to "five times as much as those levied by the King; the Pope disposed of the same bishoprics by reservations four or five times, and received each time the first-fruits."¹ "The brokers of the sinful city of Rome promoted for money unlearned and unworthy caitiffs to benefices of the value of a thousand marks, while the poor and learned hardly obtain one of twenty. So decays sound learning. They present aliens, who neither see nor care to see their parishioners, despise God's service, convey away the treasure of the realm, and are worse than Jews or Saracens. God gave his sheep to the Pope to be pastured, not shorn and shaven; lay patrons are by his example urged to sell their benefices to mere brutes, as Christ was sold to the Jews. The Pope's revenue from England alone is larger than that of any prince in Christendom. The Pope's collector and other strangers have an office in London, from whence are betrayed the secrets of the realm; the collector remits yearly to the Pope 20,000 marks, sometimes more." The Commons insist on the immediate discharge of these traitorous and dangerous strangers. They appear to adopt a return made of the Crown Benefices held by aliens. The Cardinal of St.

¹ See the petition in the Parliamentary History. Compare it with Wycliffe's views.

Sabina held the Deanery of Lichfield with annexed Prebends, worth 580 marks and 20*l.*; the Cardinal of St. Prassede had for twenty-six years held the Deanery of Salisbury, which he never saw, worth 254*l.*, and many valuable benefices annexed to it; the Cardinal of St. Angelo the Deanery of York, worth 400*l.*, with many other Prebends; others were Archdeacons of Canterbury (the richest benefice in England after the Bishoprics), of Suffolk, of York, of Durham; others possessed Prebends and various preferments. They received besides that the 20,000 marks a year.¹

The remedies the Commons proposed were the re-enactment and enforcement of the Statute of Provisors with the utmost rigor. They demanded that no foreign proctor or collector of the Pope should be permitted to remain in England under pain of life and limb; any Englishman residing at Rome in such office to be liable to the same penalty.

The Good Parliament was dissolved; before its dissolution the Black Prince had died. John of July, 1376. Gaunt resumed the administration. The Council was ignominiously dismissed. Alice Perrers was by the bedside of the King, now worn out with age, infirmity, and sorrow. The Earl of March was ordered to Calais, under the honorable pretext of surveying the castle and town. He surrendered the office of Earl Marshal; by which John of Gaunt bought the support of the Lord Percy, one of the Council. Peter de la Mare was committed prisoner to Nottingham Castle. William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, ^{William of} was impeached on eight articles of malad- ^{Wykeham.}

¹ The report, which is very curious and interesting to ecclesiastical antiquaries, is in Fox, i. p. 560.

ministration, amounting to treason, or misprision of treason.¹ The temporalities of the see were seized into the hands of the King. The Bishop of Winchester was excepted from an act of grace issued on account of the Jubilee, the fiftieth year of the reign of King Edward. At a meeting of the new Parliament, as a further indignity (his temporalities being escheated), no writ was issued to Wykeham as a peer. But he was summoned to Convocation. In Convocation, William Courtenay, Bishop of London, rose and moved that no subsidy should be granted till justice was done to the Bishop of Winchester. The Convocation took the affair up with a high hand. It was an infringement on the jurisdiction of Holy Church. The King, or rather the King's Court, treated remonstrance and petition with contempt. The timid Archbishop Whittlesey tried in vain to mediate. The Bishop of Winchester came to his palace in Southwark, and took his seat in

Feb. 28.

About

March 2.

Convocation with loud applause. Parliament was dissolved, as well as Convocation, without any reconciliation. The King, under the influence of John of Gaunt, attempted to divert the popular mind by granting the temporalities of Winchester to Richard of Bordeaux, now Prince of Wales and proclaimed heir-apparent to the Crown.

But before the death of Edward, almost his last act,²

Death of
Edward.

whether to propitiate Heaven, or still but as a passive instrument in the hands of others, was the restitution of these temporalities to the Bishop of Winchester.³ It was under a condition which shows

¹ Lowth, p. 113.

² June 18. King Edward died June 21.

³ Dr. Lingard says (note) that he made a valuable present to Alice Perers.

the vast opulence of that Prelate. He was to furnish three ships of war, with fifty men-at-arms and fifty archers for a quarter of a year, at the wages paid by the King; if the expedition was not undertaken, the amount which this army would cost.¹

Wycliffe, exactly at this time, between the dissolution of the last Parliament and the death ^{Wycliffe at} of the King, appears summoned to answer ^{St. Paul's.} at St. Paul's before the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, for opinions deserving ecclesiastical censure. Of the specific charges on this occasion nothing is known; though they may be conjectured from those submitted to the Pope, and afterwards brought against him by the Papal mandate. Wycliffe stood before the tribunal, but not alone. He was accompanied by John of Gaunt and the Lord Percy, now Earl Marshal. There was an immense throng to witness this exciting spectacle; Wycliffe could not make his way through. The Earl Marshal assumed the authority of his office to compel the crowd to recede. The Bishop of London, no doubt indignant at the unlooked-for appearance of the Nobles, resented this exercise of the Earl Marshal's power in his church. He haughtily declared that if he had known how Percy would act, he would have inhibited his entrance into the Cathedral. The Duke of Lancaster in his pride rejoined that, despite the Bishop, the Earl Marshal would use the authority necessary to maintain order. They reached with difficulty the Court in the Lady Chapel. The Earl Marshal demanded a seat for Wycliffe. "He had many things to answer, he needed a soft seat." "It is contrary,"

¹ Lowth, p. 146.

answered Courtenay, "to law and reason that one cited before his Ordinary should be seated." Fierce words ensued between the Earl Marshal and the Bishop. The Duke of Lancaster taunted the family pride of Courtenay. The Bishop replied with specious humility, "that he trusted not in man, but in God alone, who would give him boldness to speak the truth." Lancaster was overheard, or thought to be overheard, as if he threatened to drag the Bishop out of the church by the hair of his head. The populace were inflamed by the insult to the Bishop, the insult to the City of London. The privileges of the City were supposed to be menaced by the Earl Marshal's assumption of authority within the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor.¹ A wild tumult began. The proceedings were broken up: Wycliffe, who all along had stood silent, retired. Lancaster and the Earl Marshal had doubtless sufficient force to protect their persons. But throughout the City the populace arose; they attacked John of Gaunt's magnificent palace, the Savoy; his arms were reversed like those of a traitor. The palace, but for the Bishop of London, would have been burned down. A luckless clergyman, mistaken for the Earl Marshal, was brutally murdered. The Duke fled to Kennington, where the Princess of Wales was residing with her young son. The rioters were appeased by a message from the Princess: but they demanded that the Bishop of Winchester and Peter de la Mare should have their fair and immediate inquest before

¹ Lancaster was afterwards accused of a design to abolish the Lord Mayor, and to appoint a captain under the Crown; and that the Earl Marshal's power should be current in the City as in other parts of the kingdom. Lancaster did turn out the Lord Mayor and Aldermen and appoint others.

their peers, according to the laws of the land. It is difficult not to trace some latent though obscure connection between the persecution of William of Wykeham and the proceedings against John Wycliffe.¹ It was the inevitable collision between the old and the new opinions. Wykeham, the splendid, munificent, in character blameless Prelate, was wise enough to devote his vast riches to the promotion of learning, and by the foundation of noble colleges, was striving to continue the spell of the hierarchical power over the human mind. Wycliffe, seeing the more common abuse of that wealth by Prelates of baser and more sordid worldliness, sought the interests of Christ's religion in the depression, in the abrogation, of the mediæval hierarchy. The religious annals of England may well be proud of both.

The accession of Richard II. shook the overweening power of John of Gaunt. The first act under the new reign was the full and ample pardon of Wykeham, hurried through, under the Privy Seal, with the utmost despatch. Peter de la Mare was released from Nottingham Castle; Lancaster condescended to pay humble court to the City of London. Henceforth, John of Gaunt is the less avowed and open supporter of Wycliffe. If, indeed, John of Gaunt had any real love of Christian liberty and truth, he had greater love of power. Yet on the accession of Richard appears the same conflict of opinions as under the Good Parliament. The King's Ministers and his Parliament looked with greedy eyes on a considerable treasure levied on the realm, which they knew to be in the hands of the Pope's agents or bankers. They

¹ Lewis, p. 81. Stowe's Chronicle.

determined to seize it and appropriate it to the public service. But they were desirous to obtain legal sanction for this course. It is probable that among the authorities to which they appealed was the University of Oxford. It was either the function, or imposed on Wycliffe by the University, or he was chosen at the suggestion of the Crown, well knowing the bias of his opinions, to frame the answer. In that answer, as might be expected, he declared boldly that the necessities of the nation have the first and paramount claim to all moneys raised within the realm. He sheltered himself with much ingenuity under the all-venerated name of St. Bernard, and was not sorry to have the opportunity of publicly proclaiming the opinion of that Saint, that Eugenius III. could pretend to no secular dominion as the successor of St. Peter.¹

Information during this interval had been laid at Avignon against the opinions of Wycliffe. The Pope, Gregory XI., despatched his Bulls to England: three addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury Simon of Sudbury and other Bishops; one to the King; one to the University of Oxford, commanding inquiry into the erroneous doctrines of Wycliffe. The Prelates are to investigate the truth of the allegations; if true to commit to jail and obtain the confession of Wycliffe, and to transmit the same to Rome. Should they not be able to apprehend him, they are to cite him to appear before the Pope. The King is exhorted to render all assistance to the aforesaid Prelates. The University of Oxford is commanded to prohibit the teaching any of the doctrines promulgated by Wycliffe in his detestable madness, to

Pope orders
proceedings
against
Wycliffe.

¹ Fox, i. 384.

apprehend him and to deliver him to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. The University treated the Bull hardly with cold respect; they debated whether they should receive it: so far they condescended, but for the execution of its mandate they took no measures whatever. The opinions charged against Wycliffe were entirely against the ecclesiastical power, as yet he is not accused of departing from the creed of the Church: they are the opinions of Marsilius of Padua and John of Gaudun, the defenders of the temporal monarchy against the Pope; they are denounced as subversive of civil as of ecclesiastical authority.

The Archbishop, Sudbury, wrote to the Chancellor of Oxford to cite John Wycliffe to appear in the Church of St. Paul to answer for his errors. Wycliffe ^{Wycliffe at Lambeth.} appeared not at St. Paul's, but at Lambeth.

He had no longer Lancaster and the Earl Marshal at his side, but a more formidable array of partisans, the populace. Among these were citizens of London, now that their privileges were not threatened, on the side of the Reformer.¹ They forced their way into the chapel; their menacing looks and gestures affrighted the Prelates. In the midst of their alarm arrived Sir Lewis Clifford, in the name of the Princess of Wales, now at the head of the administration, prohibiting the Bishops from any further proceeding against Wycliffe. The in-

¹ There is a singular instance of the progress of Wycliffe's opinions. The Mayor of London, John of Northampton, like his puritanical successors in later days, to the great disparagement of the clergy, took the morals of the City under his own care. He arrested a number of loose women, cut off their hair, and exposed them to public derision, openly asserting that he was compelled to this act of authority by the remissness of the clergy, who for money would connive at any debauchery, and even sell licenses for incestuous marriages. — Fox, *ut supra*.

dignant historian is bitter upon their weakness. "They were as reeds shaken by the wind, became soft as oil in their speech, to the discredit of their own dignity and the degradation of the Church. Panic-stricken they were, as men that hear not, as those in whose mouth is no reproof."¹

Eighteen articles had been exhibited, probably sent from England to the Pope, by the Pope back to England, as the definite charges against the Reformer. Wycliffe drew up three replies to these articles. One he delivered to the Papal Delegates; one more brief was intended, it should seem, for general circulation. The third was in Latin, a fierce recrimination on a nameless assailant, whom he calls the "motley doctor." The first and the more full is calm, cautious, guarded; yet on some of the more momentous questions significant enough. To the first five charges, which turn on subtile and scholastic points (Wycliffe was no contemptible Schoolman), he is subtile and scholastic. In the later articles two great principles transpire without disguise: 1, That the property of the Church is not inalienable, indefeasible, but may be forfeited if it be not applied to its proper use, and that it is for the temporal power to enforce that forfeiture; 2, That spiritual powers of censure, excommunication, absolution, are not absolute and unconditional, but depend for their validity, and will be ratified by God, only if uttered or promulgated in strict conformity with the law of God. Wycliffe declares his resolution by God's grace to be a sincere churchman, he by no means declines the jurisdiction of the Church; he is prepared to deliver his opinions in writing, he is ready to defend them to death.

¹ Walsingham.

They are formed from the Sacred Scriptures and from holy doctors ; if they are proved adverse to the faith he is ready and willing to retract them.¹ Nothing further was done, beyond an injunction to Wycliffe to keep silence, lest he should mislead the ignorant.

The death of Pope Gregory XI., as it annulled the authority held by the Prelates, estopped all further proceedings. The Schism which followed was not likely to reëstablish the awe of the Pope in minds which had either shaken it off, or were ready to shake it off. Wycliffe sent out a tract on the Schism of the Church.

Wycliffe is now the head of a sect ; he becomes more and more the antagonist of the hierarchy ; as yet only of the higher and wealthier dignita-^{Wycliffite teachers.}ries, more immediately threatened by his democratic views as to their temporalities ; and of the more sagacious divines, who might discern how rapidly and how far such a mind, once released from the yoke of the ancient theology, would break loose from the established opinions. He appears not as yet to be an object of alarm or unpopularity with the lower clergy ; Oxford has not repudiated him. But he is now organizing a kind of Order of his own, who travel through the land, preaching, where favored by the clergy, in the churches, elsewhere in the highways and market-places. These itinerant teachers vied with and supplanted the Mendicant Orders in popularity. How they were maintained

¹ Dr. Lingard and Dr. Vaughan differ as to the time of publication of these writings. It appears to me that there is no certain evidence on the point ; nor is it material. The more violent was a polemic and personal tract ; the other a calm and deliberate reply before a public judicature. I see no evasion or timidity, nothing beyond ordinary discretion, in Wycliffe's conduct.

appears not; probably they were content with hospitable entertainment, with food and lodging. Such was the distinction drawn by Wycliffe between our Lord and his Apostles and the sturdy beggars whom he anathematized, and whose mode of exaction is so humorously described by Chaucer. There is always a depth of latent religiousness in the heart of the common people, and these men spoke with simplicity and earnestness the plainer truths of the Gospel in the vernacular tongue. The novelty, and no doubt, the bold attacks on the clergy, as well as the awfulness of the truths now first presented in their naked form of words, shook, thrilled, inthrilled the souls of men, most of whom were entirely without instruction, the best content with the symbolic teaching of the ritual.

Wycliffe has now at least begun his great work, the Translation of Scripture. Complete English Version of the Scriptures, and as this work proceeds, it more entirely engrosses his mind, and assumes its place as the sole authority for religious belief. It must have been sent out and widely promulgated in different portions, or it could not, before the days of printing, have become so familiar to the popular mind as to give ground to the bitter complaint of one of Wycliffe's adversaries, that laymen and women who could read were better acquainted with the Scripture than the most lettered and intelligent of the Clergy.¹

But as Wycliffe advanced in more exclusive devotion to the Sacred Writings, as by his own work of translation, and the translations of his coadjutors, he became

¹ "Unde per ipsum fit vulgare et magis apertum laicis et mulieribus legere scientibus, quam solet esse clericis admodum literatis et bene intelligentibus." — Knighton, p. 2844.

more fully acquainted with the Bible, he began to question not only the power of the Pope and of the Hierarchy, but some of the doctrines of the Church. He is now examining and rejecting with deliberate determination the materialism of the vulgar Transubstantiation. He is become not merely a dreaded and dangerous Reformer, but, according to the dominant creed, a daring and detested heresiarch. It might almost seem that Rome was in the conspiracy against her own power and sacred authority. "This very year," writes Walsingham (a high Papist, who not the less dwells with honest energy on the venality of the Court of Rome), "came the Cardinal di St. Prassede into England, to treat of the marriage of the Emperor's sister with the King, and to drain the realm of its wealth. The whole kingdom poured out to him, for there was no grace which he would not sell, none which he would grant without money: he sold indulgences, formerly reserved by the Pope to himself, for two years, for three years, excommunications, absolutions, commutations for pilgrimages. At length, his men grew wanton in their avarice; they disdained silver, would take nothing but gold: he carried off in his bags more than a year's taxes of the realm."¹

At this time also broke out the insurrection of the Commons: six counties at least — Kent, Essex, Hertford, Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge — were in furious revolt. Wat Tyler and his rude Kentish peasantry were in possession of London. Among other noble victims, the Archbishop of Canterbury had been cruelly put to death on Tower Hill.² The resolution of

¹ Walsingham, p. 246.

² The Monk of St. Denys was in London at this time. "*Michi causam*

the young King, the boldness of Walworth the Mayor of London, seem to have saved the whole realm from anarchy, the upper orders from massacre and ruin. This outburst had no connection with religion. It was a political and social insurrection; it had its immediate origin in a heavy all-burdening tax, levied in a manner to awaken all the most ardent and generous feelings of the people. Men have borne every oppression, but have been maddened beyond control by insults to their wives and daughters. The popular fury was not against the sacerdotal order: it was against the judges, the lawyers, the jurymen. They did not doom to ruin the churches or the monasteries, but the courts of law: they would destroy all the archives of the realm, probably esteeming them mere rolls and records of taxation. The Duke of Lancaster was the special object of hatred — Lancaster the patron of Wycliffe. They burned his splendid palace in the Savoy. It was not as Archbishop, but as Chancellor, that they murdered Simon of Sudbury, as one who had called them "shoeless ribalds," and urged no concession. They beheaded him as a false traitor to the Commons and to the realm.¹ At St. Alban's, at Edmondsbury, at Walsingham, it was the villains demanding manumission from their lords, not Wycliffe's disciples despoiling posses-

Ecclesiæ nostre in hoc regno promoventi (had St. Denys still property in England?) cum indignanter audirem ipsa die per ville bivia illius Archiepiscopi capud sacratum plebem pedibus huc illucque projecisse, unusque assistantium diceret, Scias in regno Franciæ abhominabiliora futura et in brevi, hoc solum subjunxi, absit ut Galliæ continuata fidelitas tanto monstro deformetur." This is a singular illustration of the public feeling.— P. 134.

¹ Knighton. Read the account of Sudbury's death in Godwin. He was a man of great eloquence, and died, it is said, imploring pardon on his enemies.

sioners. Not indeed that such insurrectionists were likely to look with much respect on the exorbitant wealth of the clergy. Some proclaimed that no taxes were to be paid till the whole Church property was confiscated and expended.¹

No popular insurrection, in truth, can take place without stirring up all the dregs of society ; all the turbulent, the designing, the political and religious fanatics are then in their element. Among the first acts of the rebels was to break open the jails. From the prison of the Archbishop of Canterbury came forth John Ball, who, years before Wycliffe had been heard of, had promulgated among the humblest classes the wildest levelling doctrines. He was a religious demagogue of the lowest order ; his tenets are contained in the old popular rhyme, "When Adam delved and Eve span, Where was then the gentleman?" He had been seized and imprisoned ; imprisonment was not likely to soften his fierce temper. His release by a violent and victorious mob of peasants would offer too tempting opportunities for vengeance on his persecutors,² and stimulate and seem to justify the propagation of his tenets to the utmost.³ Nor was John Ball alone ; there were others who mingled up doctrines of social and religious anarchy. The confession of Jack Straw is that of one

¹ Walsingham. He was a monk of St. Albans. His account of the revolt against the abbot is prolix and curious.

² Knighton says that some proposed to make John Ball their Archbishop of Canterbury. Was John Ball present at the beheading of Sudbury, and so wreaking vengeance for his imprisonment? Compare the account of John Ball in Lewis, p. 223, &c.

³ There is an inhibition by Archbishop Islip against the Mendicants, issued at the same time with that against John Ball. — Wilkins, iii. 64, 5, A. D. 1366. There is another denunciation of John Ball by Archbishop Sudbury, April 21, 1381.

of the Fraticelli. He looked forward to the glorious time when the Mendicants should possess the whole earth.¹ Walsingham accuses the Mendicants as one of the great causes of the insurrection. Jack Straw's confession was obtained by the Lord Mayor of London, who promised not pardon, but to pay for masses for his soul: he was joined in this posthumous benevolence by other charitable citizens.

This insurrection, nevertheless, had two fatal consequences to Wycliffe and to his tenets. All reformers, even the wisest and most moderate, must make up their minds to bear the odium of the exaggeration of their own opinions. No religious or social innovation can be without its danger. It is the one profound and difficult question whether mankind is to linger on in any depth of darkness, ignorance, oppression, rather than undergo that danger. Wycliffe's enemies of course denounced John Ball as his partisan.² Between the two men there was no connection, less sympathy. With Wycliffe religion was the sole, exclusive, ultimate aim; with the wilder insurgent teachers the religious was but one part of a wide, universal, social, political revolution. But those to whom all innovation is dangerous, naturally and without dishonesty refuse to discriminate between the darker and lighter shades, the anarchic and the Christian points, in the destructive doctrines which threaten their power, influence, interest, rank, authority. To them every opponent in religious matters is a blasphemer, a heretic; in civil, a demagogue and an anarchist.

¹ "Soli Mendicantes vixissent in terrâ."

² Compare Lewis, p. 221. The good sense of his observations is marred by his coarse language.

But it was not this general suspicion and jealousy alone which darkened the minds of the clergy, and wrought them up to keener vigilance against the doctrines of Wycliffe. To the murdered Simon Sudbury, who seems to have been more gentle and moderate in his ecclesiastic rule,¹ succeeded the high-born and High-Church Prelate, William Courtenay, before whom Wycliffe had already twice appeared, ^{Courtenay Archbishop.} and twice defied or escaped prosecution. Courtenay, with the indignation and terror excited by the terrible sight of his predecessor's headless trunk, was least likely to draw these just, no doubt, but not clearly discernible distinctions between the opponents of authority. With his birth, education, position, haughty temper, all resistance to ecclesiastical superiority was rebellion, sacrilege, impiety. The first act of Courtenay was to summon a Synod to deliberate and determine on the measures to be taken concerning certain strange and dangerous opinions widely prevalent, as well among the Nobility as among the Commons of the realm. The Synod met (a dire and significant omen), not at St. Paul's or Lambeth, but at the Grey Friars (Mendicants) in London. There assembled eight Bishops, fourteen Doctors of Civil and Canon Law, six Bachelors of Divinity, four Monks, fifteen Mendicants (three of these Dominicans, four Minorites, four Augustinians, four Carmelites).² Hardly had the Synod taken its seat, when an earthquake shook the Metropolis.³

¹ Sudbury appears to have been tardy and irresolute, if not unwilling, in his prosecution of Wycliffe and his doctrines. His death was by some attributed to his guilty laxity in this prosecution.

² See the names in Fox, p. 568.

³ Wycliffe himself compared this earthquake to that at the time of the Crucifixion. *Confessio*, apud Vaughan, ii. vii. Appendix.

The affrighted Synod trembled at this protest of Heaven at their proceedings. Courtenay, with no less promptitude than courage, turned it to a favorable prognostic. "The earth was throwing off its noxious vapors, that the Church might appear in her perfect purity." Twenty-four articles were gathered out of the writings of Wycliffe, ten condemned after three days' debate as heretical, the rest as erroneous. Among the heretical tenets were the denial of Transubstantiation; the assertion that the Sacraments administered by a priest in mortal sin were null; rejection of all confession but to God; a reprobate Pope had no spiritual power, only that conferred by Cæsar; there was no lawful Pope after Urban VI.; all Churches were to live like the Greeks, under their own laws; ecclesiastics were not to hold temporal possessions. One tenet ascribed to Wycliffe was that God ought to obey the devil!¹ The erroneous doctrines from which, with some specious loyalty, it was dexterously endeavored to show Wycliffe an enemy to temporal as to ecclesiastical authority, were: that a Prelate who excommunicated a person whom he did not know to be really excommunicate, was himself excommunicate; that it is treason to God and the King to excommunicate a person who has appealed to the King; that those who cease to preach, because excommunicated by priests, are excommunicate, and liable to answer in the Day of Judgment; that a Lord is no Lord, a Prelate no Prelate, while in mortal sin; that temporal Lords might take away temporal goods from delinquent ecclesiastics, and the people might aid in this; that tithes are alms to be granted to whom we will. The last article condemns altogether the relig-

¹ Article VII. Lewis, ch. vi. p. 107, 9. Wilkins, Concilia, iii. p. 157.

ious Orders, especially the Mendicants: "He who gives alms to a Mendicant is excommunicate."

Archbishop Courtenay determined to give these decrees the most imposing solemnity. A great procession of clergy and laity walked barefoot to St. Paul's to hear a sermon by a Carmelite Friar. Strong measures were taken to suppress the Preachers. An act was passed by the Lords, and promulgated by the King (the first statute of heresy passed in the realm), commanding the apprehension of all the Preachers, with their maintainers and abettors, and their committal to prison, that they might answer in the Bishops' Courts. But Oxford was still the centre of Wycliffe's influence. A Carmelite, Peter Stokes, no doubt esteemed the most eloquent preacher, was sent down to confute the new opinions. Peter Stokes preached in an empty church, while the scholars crowded around the University pulpit, where Nicolas Hereford the Vice-Chancellor, and Philip Rypington, openly maintained the doctrines of Wycliffe. The Chancellor, Peter Rigge, notoriously, if not openly, favored his cause. He answered the Archbishop's mandate to search the Colleges and Halls, and to force all who held such opinions to retract, that it was as much as his life was worth. "Is then the University," answered Courtenay, "such a fautor of heresy that Catholic truths cannot be asserted in her walls?"¹ Courtenay assumed the office and title of Grand Inquisitor. The Synod met again. The Chancellor, Peter Rigge, and Brightwell, a Doctor of Divinity, appeared.² Nicolas Hereford and Philip Rypington were compelled or permitted to recant,³ but their

¹ Lewis, p. 115. Documents, No. 34.

² Rigge and Brightwell before the synod at Lambeth, June 12.

³ Another Synod, June 18. Here Hereford and Rypington demand,

recantation was held evasive and unsatisfactory. They were publicly excommunicated at St. Paul's. They fled to implore the protection of the Duke of Lancaster. John of Gaunt coldly recommended them to submit to their superiors. Rypington afterwards absolutely disowned Wycliffe and his tenets. His apostasy was rewarded by the Bishopric of Lincoln. He became, like most apostates, a violent persecutor of his old opinions. He died a Cardinal. Nicolas Hereford is said boldly to have gone to Rome to defend the opinions of Wycliffe; there he was imprisoned, and died a monk.¹ Wycliffe himself appears neither at Oxford nor at Lambeth. He is cited, but no notice is taken of his contumacy. Perhaps he was suffering under his first attack of palsy, expected to be mortal: he was believed indeed to be at the point of death. "I shall not die," he said, "but live and declare the works of the Friars."

In a few months he is not only denouncing the Council of the Grey Friars in London, and haughtily casting back the calumny that he taught "God should obey the devil;" he proceeds to a bolder measure. He presents a petition to the King and Parliament that he may assert and maintain the articles contained in his writings, and proved by authority and reason to be the Christian faith; that all persons, now bound by vows of religion, may follow, instead thereof, the more perfect law of Christ; that tithes be bestowed,

Ashton refuses, delay. They sent in their answers June 20. These were declared insufficient, heretical, deceptive. They were excommunicated July 13. Same day was issued the King's Edict to Oxford.

¹ Yet he appears, if there is not some mistake or confusion, to have assented at Hereford to the persecution of Walter Brute. Compare the whole article on Hereford, as well as on Rypington and Ashton. — Lewis, p. 267, &c.

according to their proper use, for the maintenance of the poor; that Christ's own doctrine of the Eucharist be publicly taught; that neither King nor kingdom obey any See or Prelate further than their obedience be grounded on Scripture; that no money be sent out of the realm to the Court of Rome or of Avignon, unless proved by Scripture to be due; that no Cardinal or foreigner hold preferment in England; that if a Bishop or Curate be notoriously guilty of contempt of God, the King should confiscate his temporalities; that no Bishop or Curate should be enslaved to secular office; that no one should be imprisoned on account of excommunication.¹

Danger seemed to be gathering around Wycliffe, but Wycliffe shrunk not from danger. The Par- Nov. 19, 1382.liament was summoned to Oxford; the Convocation, as of course, accompanied the Session of Parliament; a collision of mortal strife seemed inevitable. The Duke of Lancaster, though Wycliffite in all that concerned the limitation of the power and wealth of the hierarchy, urged the Reformer to submit to his spiritual superiors in matters purely spiritual. Convocation was afraid to stir those questions which concerned the wealth of the hierarchy, the Papal taxation, and other Papal privileges. Parliament respected the exclusive right of Convocation to judge on points of doctrine. Wycliffe was called to answer, but, as it were by common consent, on one doctrine alone — that of the Eucharist.

Wycliffe, at Lutterworth and in the villages around, before the people, was the plain, bold, vernacular preacher; at Oxford, before the Convocation, he was

¹ The petition may be read in its main articles in Vaughan, ii. 97. It was printed by Dr. James, 1608.

a school divine of acuteness, subtilty, and logical versatility, in which he was perhaps the greatest and most experienced master in the University. We may imagine that among the Prelates, the high-born Primate, the Bishops of London, Norwich, Worcester, Lincoln, Sarum, Hereford, the Chancellor of the University, a host of Doctors, though some may have been, few were men of profound learning. The greater number must have found themselves fairly caught in the meshes of Wycliffe's metaphysic web ; at one moment catching words which sounded like the most rigid orthodoxy, at another trembling at nice distinctions which seemed to threaten the most fatal consequences. So completely does Wycliffe seem to have perplexed and bewildered his auditory, that of the monastic historians one boasts of his speech as a humble recantation ; one as a bold confutation of the Doctors of the Second Millenary period of the Church, of all who had taught, after Transubstantiation, in its most materialistic form, had become a doctrine of the Church ; as an assertion of the tenets of Berengar of Tours.¹ Nor can Wycliffe himself be fairly charged with insincerity, disingenuousness, or even politic art. His view of the Eucharist is singularly consistent, as much so as may be on so abstruse a subject. He is throughout laboring to reconcile a Real Presence with the rejection of the grosser Transubstantiation. The Eucharist is Christ's Body and Blood spiritually, sacramentally ; but the bread and wine are not annihilated by transmutation. They coëxist, though to the mind of the believer the elements are virtually the veritable Body and Blood of the Redeemer.²

¹ Knighton. Walsingham, p. 283.

² Apud Vaughan, Appendix, vols. ii. vi. and vii. Wycliffe asserts that

That he was condemned by such a Court was matter of course. The condemnation was publicly promulgated in the school of the Augustinian Monks. Wycliffe was sitting in his chair as Professor, and holding, in academic phrase, his Determinations¹ on the other side. He is said to have been confounded by his condemnation. He might well be somewhat appalled: all his followers — even Ashton, who till now had adhered to him — had been reconciled or consented to reconciliation.² Lancaster advised submission. But he soon resumed his intrepidity; he appealed, to their indignation, not to the spiritual but to the temporal authority; not to the Pope but to the King.³ Lancaster in vain urged him to yield; he refused with calm pertinacity: "On this point all have erred but Berengarius."

Wycliffe retired unmolested to Lutterworth: no one can doubt that he would have shown the ^{Wycliffe}dauntlessness of a martyr. But there was ^{at Lutter-}worth. as yet no statute in England for the burning of heretics: no officer, without legal warrant, would have obeyed, as in other countries, the mandate of the Church. His adversaries were too wise or too timid to urge extreme measures, such as imprisonment. It

a third part of the Clergy believed with him, and would die for their belief.

¹ "*Tota prædicta condemnatio promulgata est publicè in scholis Augustiniensium, ipso sedente in cathedrâ et determinante contrarium. Sed confusus est auditâ condemnatione.*" From the official report, Wilkins, iii. 176.

² Rypington was reconciled Oct. 30; Ashton, Dec. 27; Laurence Bedeman, earlier.

³ "*Volens per hoc se protegere regali potestate quod non premeretur vel ecclesiasticâ potestate.*" — In the report of the twelve judges appointed to examine into his opinions, he is said to have appealed "*ad seculare brachium.*" They compare him to Arius. Peter Stokes, the Carmelite, had now become involved in heresy.

is extremely doubtful whether Lancaster and the Parliament would have consented to any act of rigor, and the Primate would not unnecessarily submit to the refusal of the secular power to execute his warrant: his own person had not been safe. Perhaps there was a tacit understanding that Wycliffe should leave Oxford, the most dangerous field of his influence.

In the two years' interval between the appearance of Wycliffe before the Convocation in Oxford and his death, an event occurred not likely with the thoughtful, or with those whose reverence for the Pope and the hierarchy was already shaken, to impair the cause of the Reformers. If the followers of Wycliffe gradually surrendered themselves to a fanatic madness, and became more and more daringly and insultingly hostile to the Clergy, the Clergy might seem under a judicial determination to justify those worst extravagances of hatred.

Just at the time when the Schism had shaken the Papacy to its base, and Wycliffe had denounced both Popes alike as Antichrist,¹ and had found strong sympathy in the hearts and minds of men; when the malappropriation of the vast revenues of the Church, which were asserted to be the patrimony of the poor, had been declared in many quarters to demand their confiscation for the public good; when the people had been abused by the fond but captivating notion that by such measures they might be relieved forever from the burden of taxation; when motions were entertained in the English Parliament to expel churchmen even from the more peaceful functions in the state; and, indeed, in some

*Crusade of
Pope against
Pope.*

¹ Wycliffe was more inclined to Urban VI. — See Lewis, p. 120, note.

quarters notions of the unlawfulness of war were beginning to dawn : for the first time a holy civil war is proclaimed in Christendom, especially in England, the seat of these new opinions ; a war of Pope against Pope. The Pontiff of Rome promulgates a crusade against the Pontiff of Avignon. A Bishop (Norwich) is at the head of the English host. Public prayers are put up, by order of the Primate, in every church of the realm, for the success of the expedition into Flanders. The Bishops and the Clergy are called on by the Archbishop to enforce upon their flocks the duty of contribution to this sacred purpose. Money, jewels, property of all kinds, are lavishly brought in, or rigidly extorted ; it is declared meritorious to fight for the faith, glorious to combat for the Lord. The same indulgences are granted as to Crusaders to the Holy Land.¹

Spencer, the young and martial Bishop of Norwich, had distinguished himself during the peasant insurrection in Norfolk. At the head of eight lances and a few archers, he had boldly arrested one of the ring-leaders. A few knights gathered round him. Armed from head to foot, with a huge two-handed sword, he attacked an immense rabble, hewed them down, put the rest to flight, seized the captain, a dyer of Norwich, and reduced his diocese to peace by these victories, and by remorseless executions. This same Bishop set himself at the head of the crusade. The powers intrusted to him by the Pope were enormous : he had full Papal

¹ The preamble to the Archbishop's mandate for public prayers throughout the realm, begins with "Rex pacificus, Jesus Christus." It enlarges on the blessings of peace, and goes on : "Quam meritorium sit pugnare pro fide ; quamque decorum pugnare pro Domino." Courtenay's own words !

authority. He addressed all the parish priests in the province of York, urging them to compel contributions by every means, by confessions, by indulgences. Parliament murmured that such a vast array of the king's forces should be sent out of the realm under so inexperienced a general: but Hugh Calverly, and some of the old soldiers of the French wars, scrupled not to serve under the mitred captain.¹

But after all, the issue of the expedition, at first successful, was in the end as shameful and disastrous as it was insulting to all sound religious feeling. The crusaders took Gravelines, they took Dunkirk; and this army of the Pope, headed by a Christian Bishop, in a war so-called religious, surpassed the ordinary inhumanity of the times. Men, women, and children, were hewn to pieces in one vast massacre. After these first successes the London apprentices, and the villains throughout the kingdom, were seized with a crusading ardor. They mounted white cloaks, with red crosses on their shoulders, red scabbards to their swords, and marched off defying their masters.² Many religious, monks and friars, followed their example.³ The crusaders had neither the pride nor consolation of permanent success. The army of Spencer returned as ingloriously as it had conducted itself atrociously. He

¹ See in the Close Rolls (edited by Mr. Devon) the issue of money for Spencer's crusade by the hands of John Philpot, for wages in the war, and reward for 2500 men-at-arms and 2500 archers, 6266*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* — 9th year of Richard II., 1385.

² John Philpot, the magnificent Mayor of London, had raised 1000 men-at-arms at his own expense. He took great interest in the Bishop's expedition, and kept ships to give these volunteers free passage.

³ Of these religious, says Walsingham, it was "in magnum personarum suarum dedecus et detrimentum, quia non propter Jesum Christum peregrinare decreverant, sed ut patriam mundumque videant." — P. 301.

had 60,000 men, besides auxiliaries from Ghent. Before Ypres he failed shamefully. At the first approach of the French army he withdrew to Gravelines, and was glad to buy a safe retreat by the surrender of the town.¹

On Innocents' Day, two years after the condemnation at Oxford, during the celebration of the Mass in the church of Lutterworth, Wycliffe was struck again with paralysis. He died on the last day of the year. In the suddenness of his death, in the day of his death, in the fearful distortions which usually accompany that kind of death, nothing was lost upon his adversaries, who of course held him to be a victim of Divine wrath. He died, it was said, on the day of St. Silvester: to the memory of that Saint, as the fatal receiver of the donation of Constantine, he had ever been implacably hostile. By another account he died on the day of St. Thomas of Canterbury: he was struck while impiously inveighing against that Martyr of the Church.²

Yet Wycliffe, though the object of the bitterest hatred, even in his own day awed his most violent antagonists into something approaching to admiration. His austere exemplary life has defied even calumny: his vigorous, incessant efforts to reduce the whole clergy to primitive poverty, have provoked no retort as to his own pride, self-interest, indulgence, inconsistent with his earnest severity. His industry, even in those laborious

¹ At a later period, when the Lollards, by preaching against pilgrimages, endangered the interests of our Lady of Walsingham, Bishop Spencer swore that if any of Wycliffe's preachers came into his diocese, he would burn or behead him. "Faith and religion remained inviolate in the diocese of Norwich." — Walsingham, 341.

² Walsingham, p. 312. The historian consigns him to the companionship of Cain.

days, was astonishing. The number of his books, mostly indeed brief tracts, baffles calculation. Two hundred are said to have been burned in Bohemia. How much of the translation of the Scripture he executed himself, is not precisely known; but even if in parts only superintended, it was a prodigious achievement for one man, so deeply involved as he was in polemic warfare with the hierarchy, the monks, and the Mendicant Orders.¹ He was acknowledged to be a consummate master in the dialectics of the Schools: he was the pride, as well as the terror of Oxford. "He was second to none," so writes a monk, "in philosophy; in the discipline of the Schools, incomparable."² In this, indeed, appear at once his strength, and the source of the apparent contradictions in the style and matter of his writings. Wycliffe was a subtle schoolman, and a popular religious pamphleteer. He addressed the students of the University in the language and in the logic of their schools; he addressed the vulgar, which included no doubt the whole laity and a vast number of the parochial clergy, in the simplest and most homely vernacular phrase. Hence he is, as it were, two writers: his Latin is dry, argumentative, syllogistic, abstruse, obscure: his English rude, coarse, but clear, emphatic, brief, vehement; with short stinging sentences, and perpetual hard antithesis.³

His life shows that his religious views were progressive. His ideal was the restoration of the pure moral

¹ The most curious charge against the translators of the Bible is that it was the *Eternal Gospel* of Joachim and John Peter Oliva which they were publishing. Was this ignorance or malice?

² Knighton.

³ See, for instance, the long passage in the tract "*Antichrist and his Meynie*," published by Dr. Todd of Dublin.

and religious supremacy to religion. This was the secret, the vital principle of his antisacerdotalism, of his pertinacious enmity to the whole hierarchical system of his day. That the caste of the Clergy was then discharging its lofty moral and religious mission, was denied by every pure and holy mind of the time; the charge was admitted by all the wise, even by Councils. The cause of all this evil, Wycliffe, like many others, saw in their exorbitant wealth. He could not but contrast with the primitive poverty of Christ and his Apostles, that wealth, whether in estates held by those whom he called "possessioners," the tithes exacted from the whole realm, and all which was extorted chiefly in kind by the sturdy beggars among the Mendicants. The Clergy had a right to a frugal, hospitable maintenance, but no more. This wealth was at once held by a false tenure, being the patrimony of the poor, and was forfeited by misuse, and by the neglect and non-performance of the conditions on which it was held. It was therefore not merely lawful, it was the bounden duty of the State, of the King, or the Emperor, to confiscate the whole of these escheated riches; it was the duty of every one to refuse tithe to a priest, who, according to his notions, did not discharge his duty (Wycliffe could not or would not see the wide field he opened, by investing fallible and interested men with this judgment, to avarice and bad passions). It was a sin, a sin deserving excommunication, to contribute to the rapacious quests of the Mendicants.

Wycliffe is charged with holding and urging in the broadest and most comprehensive form, what is called the doctrine of dominion founded in grace; that is, that the possession of anything whatever, even of a

wife, depended on the state of grace in which a man might be. Wycliffe no doubt maintained in theory, that all the gifts of God (God, as it were, the One great feudal Suzerain), and of Christ, on account of his original righteousness,¹ were held on the condition of holiness.² But I have never read, nor seen adduced, any sentence of his writings, in which he urges the application or enforcement of this principle. He recognizes civil possession as something totally distinct, as a full and legal right. This notion of dominion is diametrically opposed to all his arguments for the right to the resumption of ecclesiastical property by the State. But the ecclesiastics, to whose possessions, as held by sinful and unworthy men, Wycliffe remorselessly applies this rule, had the sagacity to see that this was a logical inference, an inference which Wycliffe himself may sometimes, in his incautious intrepidity, not always have avoided. They argued upon, refuted, condemned it, as if it were in truth, his favorite, fundamental maxim. A demagogue so dangerous to their order must be made out a demagogue dangerous to all orders. The religious reformer must be convicted on his own principles, as a political and social anarchist. Nor in their view was this difficult, hardly dishonest. Their property, they averred, was that of God, or at least of his Saints; it boasted a far higher, and a more sacred title than civil possessions: to despoil them was

¹ "Titulo autem originalis justitiæ habuit Christus omnia bona mundi, ut sæpe declarat Augustinus, illo titulo, vel titulo gratiæ justorum sunt omnia, *sed longè ab illo titulo* civilis possessio. Unde Christus et sui Apostoli spretà dominatione civili, fuerunt de habitatione purâ, secundum illum titulum contentati," &c., &c. See the whole curious passage (strangely misprinted) in Vaughan, ii. 235.

² So he seems to interpret the "saints shall inherit the earth."

sacrilege, impiety, the spoliation of others only the less heinous crime of robbery : one was an outrage on the divine, the other but a breach of human law.¹

Wycliffe, after all, was not merely premature as a Reformer of Christianity, he was incomplete and insufficient. He was destructive of the existing system, not reconstructive of a new one. In the translation of the Latin Scripture, and the assertion of the sole authority of Scripture, he had laid the foundation, but he had built on it no new edifice. He had swept away one by one almost all the peculiar tenets of mediæval Latin Christianity, pardons, indulgences, excommunications, absolutions, pilgrimages ; he had condemned images, at least of the Persons of the Trinity ; he had rejected Transubstantiation. But Teutonic Christianity had to await more than two centuries and a half before it offered a new system of doctrine to the religious necessities of man. Lutheranism, Anglicanism, Calvinism, are forms of faith ; from Wycliffism it would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to frame a creed like that of Augsburg, Articles like those of the Church of England, or even those of Westminster.

¹ This is among the singular facts, which appear from the refutation by Woodford (*apud* Brown, *Fasciculus*), one of the most instructive documents concerning Wycliffism. This was the doctrine also of Armachanus, Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh.

CHAPTER VII.

THE LOLLARDS.

WYCLIFFE left no heir to his authority or his influence; he had organized no sect. But his opinions, or some of his opinions, had sunk into the hearts of multitudes. Knighton (but Knighton wrote at Leicester in the immediate neighborhood of Wycliffe) declares, in his bitterness, that every second man you met was a Wycliffite. Under the vague name of Lollards, they were everywhere; bound together by no public, as far as is known, by no secret association; only by common sympathies and common jealousy of the clergy. Many of them no doubt were more, many less, than Wycliffites. They were of all orders, ranks, classes; they were near, and even on, the throne; they were in the baronial castle, in the city among the substantial burghers, in the peasant's hut, even in the monastery. Wycliffe's own personal influence had cast a spell over some of the highest personages in the realm. His doctrines were looked on with favor by the widow of the Black Prince, by John of Gaunt, above all by the Queen of Richard II., Anne of Bohemia. The Good Queen Anne,¹ as she was popularly

¹ It is an observable indication of popular feeling that "good" seems to be the especial appellative of those most hostile to the Clergy. The "good" Queen Anne; the "good" Parliament, though its popularity rose

called, if not in doctrine, in the foundation of her doctrine, reverence for the Scripture, was a Wycliffite. She had the Gospels at least in Bohemian, in English, and in Latin.¹ It was through her attendants that grew up not only the political, but the close and intimate religious connection between Bohemia and England. Through them these doctrines passed to John Huss and Jerome of Prague. Not only does the Council of Constance denounce these teachers as disciples of Wycliffe; in repelling and anathematizing Wycliffe, it assumes that it is repelling and anathematizing the Bohemian Reformers. An Englishman, Peter Payne,² throughout the Hussite War, is one of the leaders of religion, one of the great authorities of the Bohemian faith. Among the Wycliffite noblemen the Earl of Salisbury is claimed by Fox, and branded by Walsingham as an obstinate and shameless Lollard, a despiser of images, a scoffer at the Sacraments.³ His fate will ere long appear. A list of ten or twelve knights of property and influence has been preserved, who openly avowed the Wycliffite opinions: among these was the hero and martyr of Lollardism, Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham.⁴ London was their strong-

Anne Queen
of Bohemia.

no doubt much out of its attachment to the Black Prince; the "good" Duke Humphrey, the adversary of Cardinal Beaufort, who had been the most distinguished general in the Anti-Hussite wars. I suspect, too, some latent connection between the Lollard party and Duke Humphrey.

¹ "Nobilis regina Angliæ, soror Cæsaris, habet Evangelium, in linguâ triplici, exaratum, scilicet in linguâ Bohemicâ, Teutonicâ, et Latinâ." I translate "Teutonicâ" English. — Wycliffe, apud Lewis. Anne of Bohemia died 1392.

² On Peter Payne, Lewis, p. 229. Compare Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, especially iii. 2, p. 485.

³ "Lollardorum fautor in totâ vitâ, et imaginum vilipensor, contemptor canonum, sacramentorumque derisor."

⁴ See ch. x., Lewis's *Life of Wycliffe*. Sir Thomas Latymer, Sir Lewis

hold. The sober and wealthy citizens were advancing in intelligence and freedom, jealous no doubt of the riches of the clergy gained without risk or labor, spent with splendor and ostentation which shamed their more homely and frugal living.¹ Nor were they without active proselytes in the lower and more unruly classes. Peter Patishull, an Augustinian Monk, though appointed one of the Pope's chaplains (a lucrative and honorable office, which conferred great privileges, and was commonly bought at a great price), embraced Wycliffism. He preached publicly on the vices of the clergy, at St. Christopher's in London. The Augustinians burst into the church, and served an interdict on the unsilenced teacher. The Lollards drove them out. Patishull affixed a writing on the doors of St. A.D. 1387. Paul's, "that he had escaped from the companionship of the worst of men to the most perfect and holy life of the Lollards."² The midland towns, rising into opulence, were full of Wycliffism, especially Leicester. There the Primate Courtenay took his seat in full Pontificals on the trial of certain heretics, who seem to have been of note; their accusers were the clergy of the town. They were anathematized with bell, book, and candle, and read their recantation.³

Clifforde, Sir John Peeche, Sir Richard Story, Sir Reginald de Hylton, Sir John Trussel, with Dukes and Earls. Lewis is quoting Knighton. Lewis gives an account of these men. To these he adds (p. 242) Sir William Nevill, Sir John Clenbourn, Sir John Mountague (p. 243), and Sir Lawrence de St. Martin (p. 244).

¹ Among Walsingham's reproachful appellations heaped on the Londoners is "*Lolardorum sustentatores*." Compare Lewis's account of the reforming Mayor, John of Northampton, p. 255. He was connected with Chaucer. — *Life of Chaucer*, and Note forward.

² Fox, i. p. 661, from Chronicle of St. Albans.

³ Wilkins, iii. 208.

But the strength of the party was in the lower orders of society. Among them the name of Lollard, of uncertain origin (it is doubtful whether it was a name adopted by themselves or affixed as odious and derisive by their enemies¹), comprehended no doubt, besides the religious, a vast mass of the discontented and revolutionary. In the latter years of his reign the King, Richard II., was hastily summoned from Ireland by the urgent solicitations of the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London. An outbreak of the Lollards was said to threaten the peace of the realm. London was placarded with menacing sentences; they were affixed on the doors of St. Paul's and of St. Peter in Westminster. A remonstrance was addressed to the Houses of Parliament. This expostulatory petition showed that the grave and more prudent influence of the master was withdrawn; that his opinions had worked deeply down into a lower region. It does not appear that the more noble or distinguished followers of Wycliffe were concerned in the movement, which was an outburst of popular fanaticism. Petition of Lollards.

It was vehemently, in every point, antipapal, anti-Roman. It was Wycliffite, but beyond Wycliffism. "Since the Church of England, fatally following that of Rome, has been endowed with temporalities, faith, hope, and charity have deserted her communion. Their Priesthood is no Priesthood; men in mortal sin cannot convey the Holy Ghost. The Clergy profess celibacy, but from their pampered living are unable to practise it. The pretended miracle of Transubstantiation leads to idolatry. Exorcisms or Benedictions are vain, delusive, and diabolical. The realm cannot prosper so

¹ I cannot satisfy myself on this point.

long as spiritual persons hold secular offices. One who unites the two is an hermaphrodite. All chantries of prayer for the dead should be suppressed: 100 religious houses would be enough for the spiritual wants of the realm. Pilgrimages, the worshipping images or the Cross, or relics, is idolatry. Auricular confession, indulgences, are mischievous or a mockery. Capital punishments are to be abolished as contrary to the New Testament. Convents of females are defiled by licentiousness and the worst crimes. All trades which minister to pride or luxury, especially goldsmiths and sword-cutlers, are unlawful."

These murmurs of a burdened and discontented populace were lost in the stir of great political events, the dethronement of the King, his death, and the accession of the Lancastrian dynasty.

The son and successors of John of Gaunt inherited neither the policy nor the religion, if it was the religion, of their ancestor. Henry IV. to strengthen himself on his usurped throne, Henry V. to obtain more lavish subsidies for his French wars, Henry VI. from his meek and pious character, entered into close and intimate alliance with the Church. Religious differences are but faintly traced in the Wars of the Roses.

The high-born Arundel had succeeded the high-born Courtenay in the See of Canterbury. It is remarkable to see the two Primates, Canterbury and York, on adverse sides in the revolution which dispossessed Richard II. of his throne. Arundel was already, before the landing of Henry at Ravensperg, deep in conspiracy against King Richard. His brother, the Earl of Arundel, had been executed

Accession of
Henry IV.

Arundel
Archbishop,
1397.

before his face ; himself had fled, or had been banished to France. Neville of York adhered to Richard's fortunes, and suffered degradation, or a kind of ignominious translation to St. Andrew's in Scotland.¹ The name, rank, influence, bold character of Arundel contributed more than all other adherents to the usurpation of Henry Bolingbroke. The Archbishop of Canterbury received the abdication of Richard. Scrope, who succeeded Neville as Archbishop of York, was one of the King's Proctors on his renunciation of the crown. Arundel presented Henry to the people as their king. Arundel set the crown on his brow. When the heads of the Earls of Kent and Salisbury (the famous Lollard) and of six knights, after their vain insurrection and their defeat near Cirencester, were sent to London to be exposed on the bridge, they were received and accompanied by the Bishops and Clergy in solemn procession, in full pontificals, chanting *Te Deum*.² Arundel might seem to have forgotten, in his loyal zeal, that he was the successor of Becket. In that insurrection two clergymen were

¹ The northern prelates seem to have adhered to Richard II. Merks, Bishop of Carlisle, in a speech of singular boldness and force, defended the deposed monarch. — See Collier, i. p. 610. See above reference to Papal Letter, p. 371, note 1.

² So writes the Monk of St. Denys, as if present. "*Aderant et præcidentes, qui capita comitum Cantie et de Salisberry, sex quoque aliorum militum, longis lanceis affixa defferebant cum lituis et instrumentis musicis, ut sic cives ad horrendum spectaculum convenirent. Cumque Pontifices cum Clero sacris vestibus induti processionabantur, Te Deum laudamus altis vocibus cantando obviam scelesti (o?) muneri processissent, tandem ad introitum pontis suspensa sunt capita, membra quoque per campestria sparsa sunt, feris et avibus devoranda.*" — L. xx. c. 16, p. 738. When the quarters of these unhappy men were brought to London, no less than 18 bishops and 32 mitred abbots joined the populace, and met them with the most indecent marks of joy and exultation. See, too, the conduct of the Earl of Rutland. — Hume, Henry IV.

hanged, drawn, and quartered without remonstrance from the Primate.¹ When Archbishop Scrope, after the revolt of the Percies, is beheaded as a traitor, Arundel keeps silence.

Archbishop Arundel was to be propitiated or rewarded by all concessions which could be demanded by a partisan so unscrupulous and of so much influence. Almost the first act of Henry IV., notwithstanding these bold infringements on the personal sanctity of consecrated persons, was to declare himself the champion of the hierarchy against her dangerous enemies. In the first Convocation a welcome message was delivered, that the new King would be the Protector of the Church. The Prelates were urged to take measures for the suppression of itinerant preachers; A.D. 1399. the Crown promised its aid and support. The King, in his first speech in Parliament, announced the same deliberate determination to maintain the Catholic faith. The Commons returned their humble thanks for his Majesty's zeal in the assertion of the Catholic faith and the liberties of the Church.

In England alone a Statute was necessary to legalize the burning of heretics.² In all other parts
Statute de
Hæretico
Comburendo. of Christendom the magistrate had obeyed the summons of the clergy. The Sovereign, either of his own supreme authority, or under the old Roman Imperial Law, had obsequiously executed the mandates of the Bishop. The secular arm received

¹ Walsingham, p. 363.

² Blackstone indeed says (B. iv. c. 4) of the writ de hæretico comburendo that "it is thought by some to be as ancient as the common law itself. Compare Hales's Pleas of the Crown. The king might issue such a writ. But is there any instance of such writ actually issued in England?"

the delinquent against the law of the Church. The judgment was passed in the Ecclesiastical Court or that of the Inquisition; but the Church, with a kind of evasion which it is difficult to clear from hypocrisy, would not be stained with blood. The Clergy commanded, and that under the most awful threats, the fire to be lighted and the victim tied to the stake by others, and acquitted themselves of the cruelty of burning their fellow-creatures.

King Henry IV. and the Parliament (even the Commons, now affrighted no doubt by the A.D. 1400. wild and revolutionary tenets ascribed to all the Lollards, and avowed by some) enacted the Statute which bears the ill-omened appellation, "for the burning of heretics." The preamble was directed in the most comprehensive terms against the new preachers.¹ It was averred that in their public preachings, in their schools, through their books, they stirred up and inflamed the people to sedition, insurrection, and other enormities too horrible to be heard, in subversion of the Catholic Faith and the doctrine of Holy Church, in diminution of God's honor, and also in destruction of the estate, rights, and liberties of the Church of England. These preachings, schools, books were strictly inhibited. The Bishop of the diocese was empowered to arrest all persons accused or suspected of these acts, to imprison them, to bring them to trial in his court. "If he shall refuse to abjure such doctrines, or, having abjured, relapse, sentence is to be recorded: a writ issued to the sheriff of the county, the mayor or bailiff of the nearest borough, who is to take order that on a high place in public, before the face of the people he be burned."

¹ But see Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii. p. 221.

Nor was this Statute an idle menace; the Primate and the Bishops hastened to make examples under its terrible provisions.

William Sautree is the protomartyr of Wycliffism.

William Sautree. But the first victim, while he displays most fully the barbarity of the persecutors, does not lead the holy army with much dignity. His sufferings alone entitle him to profound commiseration. He was chosen perhaps as an example to overawe London, and as one whose fate would not provoke dangerous sympathy. William Sautree had been Priest of St. Margaret's in King's Lynn: he was now a preacher at St. Osyth in the City. He had been already arraigned and convicted before that model of a Christian Prelate, the warlike Bishop of Norwich. On his trial in London, he not only recanted and withdrew his recantation (a more pardonable weakness), he daringly denied that he had ever been on trial before. The record of the Court of Norwich was produced before him. He had already been condemned as a heretic for the denial of Transubstantiation. He was now doomed to the flames, as a relapsed heretic. The ceremony of his degradation took place at St. Paul's, with all its minute, harassing, impressive formalities. He was then delivered over, and for the first time the air of London was darkened by the smoke of this kind of human sacrifice. The writ for the execution of Sautree distinctly stated that the burning of heretics is enjoined by the law of God as well as of man, and by the canons of the Church. The act was that of the King, by the advice of the Lords and Commons. The burning was in abhorrence of the crime, and as an example to all other Christians.¹

¹ The account is in Fox. Compare House of Lancaster, p. 35.

Yet if the Commons had assented (if they did formally assent to the persecuting Statute), if they had petitioned for its rigid enforcement against the Lollards, and those who rejected the Catholic doctrines, there was still great jealousy of the more unpopular abuses in the Church. In the fourth year of Henry petitions were presented,¹ that all Monks of French birth should be expelled from the country, all priories held by foreigners seized, every benefice have its vicar bound to reside, and to exercise hospitality; that no one should be allowed to enter into any of the four Mendicant Orders under the age of 24. The King assented to limit the age to 18.² The next session the King, by his Chancellor, as though to awe the boldness of Parliament, again declared it to be his royal will to maintain the Church, as his ancestors had maintained it, in all its liberties and franchises. He compared the realm and its three estates to the human body. The Church was the right side, the King the left, the Commonalty the other members. The answer of the Commons was an address to the King to dismiss his Confessor and two others of his household. Henry not merely submitted, but declared that he would retain no one about his person who had incurred the hatred of his people. Nothing could equal the apparent harmony of the King and his Parliament. He entreated them not to be abashed or to refrain from giving their good counsel. They desired that he would notify to them the honora-

¹ Rot. Parliament. iii. 459.

² Walsingham gives a whimsical illustration of the feeling about the Mendicants. He says that Owen Glendower's dealings with devils were instigated and aided by the Friar Minors. But he is shocked at his own words. "*Absit ut hominibus tam sanctam professis regulam ut cum dæmonibus tantam contraherent familiaritatem.*" — P. 366.

ble and virtuous persons whom he named for his household, and that he would appoint no foreigners. The King again graciously assented: he even promised to live upon his own. "The King is willing so to do, as soon as he well may." But the Commons were well aware of the weakness of Henry's title. So far as that the Commonalty might relieve themselves from taxation by throwing the burden on the wealth of the Church, they were all Lollards. They represented that while the knights were worn out in service against the King's enemies, the clergy sat idle at home. Primate Arundel answered that their vassals followed the King to his wars; that they paid their tenths more promptly than the laity their fifteenths, besides the potent aid of their prayers. The Speaker (he was a knight, John Cheyne,¹ who had been in deacon's orders, and thrown them off without license) betrayed in his voice and look something of heretical or knightly disparagement of the value of their prayers. Arundel broke out, "No kingdom ever prospered without devotion; nor think thou to plunder the Church, so long as there is an Archbishop of Canterbury, thou wilt do it at thy peril." The Primate fell on his knees before the wavering King, imploring him to respect his oaths, and to protect the rights of the Church. The obstinate Commons persisted in their unwelcome representations. They urged from a schedule, with tempting and nicely-calculated particulars, that the temporal possessions of the Bishops, Abbots, Priors, now idly wasted, would furnish to the realm 15 Earls, 1500 Knights, 6200 Squires. The King forbade them to discuss such high matters. They

Strife in
Parliament.

A.D. 1407.

¹ Walsingham, p. 572.

began still more to show their anti-hierarchical spirit. They demanded a mitigation of the statute against the Lollards. The King answered that it ought to be made more severe. But for some unexplained reason a subsequent answer to the same petition was in milder terms, yet "this relaxation was not to be alleged as an example."

In the midst of these significant struggles between the King and the Commons—the King pledged by gratitude and by his interests to maintain the hierarchy to the utmost; the Commons, if not in open assertion of religious liberty, looking with greedy and jealous eyes on the estates of the clergy: the second victim on record of the sanguinary law was sent to public execution. He was but a humble tailor ^{March 1, 1409.} of the diocese of Worcester. Why, among all the Lollards, who boasted that they were 100,000, this poor man was chosen for this melancholy distinction does not appear. John Badbee had already ^{Badbee burned.} been tried and condemned in the Court of the Bishop of Worcester. His crime was the ordinary one, the denial of Transubstantiation; and this, excepting that in one respect it was coarsely expressed,¹ from the usual objections which formed part of the Wycliffite creed. He was summoned to London before a more dignified and solemn tribunal. The Primate sat with the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Oxford, Norwich, Salisbury, Bath, Bangor, St. David's, Edmund Duke of York, the Chancellor, and the Master of the Rolls. The poor man's answers were given with courage and firmness in words

¹ He said that John Bates of Bristol had as much power and authority to make the like body of Christ as any priest had. — Fox. i. 679.

of simplicity and plain sense. He said that he would believe "the Omnipotent God in Trinitie," and said, moreover, "if every Host being consecrated at the altar were the Lord's body, that then there be 20,000 Gods in England. But he believed in one God Omnipotent." Every effort was made to incline him to retract. Arundel the Primate condescended to urge him in the strongest terms to submission. He was condemned in a second great Court, held in St. Paul's. He was brought out to be burned in Smithfield. The Prior of St. Bartholomew's, as if to overawe him, brought out the Sacrament. The Prince of Wales, Henry, chanced to be present. At the first sensation of the fire, the poor man cried out "Mercy!" The Prince ordered the fire to be removed. But it was to the mercy of God, not of man, that Badbee appealed. Neither persuasions nor the promises of a yearly maintenance could subdue his quiet but inflexible courage; he was thrust back into the blazing cask, and perished in the flames. Did Prince Henry turn away his eyes?¹

William Thorpe, arraigned before this time, was a man of higher station and character. He was tried before Arundel; his trial lasted a considerable time; it almost appears that it was protracted for more than a year. But it is most remarkable that, after all, it is not known what was his fate. He lived to write an account of his trial; it is probable that he was kept in prison.²

On the accession of Henry V., the religious conduct
Accession of Henry V. of the gay and dissolute Prince might have

¹ Walsingham as well as Fox relates his death, — P. 379.

² This is the conjecture of Fox. The trial is curious. The trial or arraignment began in 1407.

been an object of apprehension ; the Lollards might hope that at least, notwithstanding his doubtful conduct at the execution of Badbee, he would not be the slave of the hierarchy. These apprehensions and these hopes were speedily dissipated, whether by any acts or words of Henry ; by the early betrayal of his ambitious designs, into which the sagacious Church afterwards threw itself with the most loyal ardor ; or from the no less sagacious prescience of his character among the Lollards. The Lollards might well mistrust the son of Henry IV. ; and such men, among many of whom fanaticism was the height of virtue, were not likely to disguise their mistrust, or to refrain from taking measures perhaps for their safety, perhaps for more than safety. Whatever the causes of this mutual jealousy, the Lollards seem to have begun the strife. On the doors of the churches in London appeared menacing notices, that to the number of 100,000 men, they were prepared to maintain their opinions by force of arms.

The head of the Lollards was Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, a man of the highest military reputation, who had served with great distinction in the French wars. His whole soul was now devoted to his religion. Through his influence unlicensed preachers swarmed through the country, especially in the dioceses of London, Rochester, and Hereford. The Primate Arundel was not a man to shrink from bold and decisive measures in his own diocese, or not to force to issue the King's yet undeclared opinions on this momentous question. He summoned the Convocation of the Clergy. Lord Cobham was accused as having spoken contemptuously of the power and au-

Oldcastle,
Lord Cobham.

thority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, of holding heretical opinions on the Eucharist, on Penance, Pilgrimages, the Power of the Keys. On these crimes he was denounced to the King. Henry honored the valiant knight, the skilful general, who had already distinguished himself in the wars of France, who might hereafter (for Henry's ambitious schemes were assuredly within his heart) be of signal service in the same fields. He had no doubt that his own arguments would convince so noble a subject, so brave a soldier, so aspiring a knight. But Henry was just emerged from his merry life ; at least, with all mistrust of the potent enchantments of Shakspeare, Henry's youth can have been no school for serious theology. He knew not much of the depth of religious feeling which possessed the disciples of Wycliffe. He resented the more the unexpected resistance of Cobham ; his disobedience was almost treason. Cobham, as it is related, protested the most submissive loyalty. " You I am most prompt and willing to obey : you are a Christian King, the Minister of God, that bears not the sword in vain for the punishment of wicked doers and the reward of the virtuous. To you, under God, I owe my whole obedience. Whatsoever you command me in the name of the Lord, that am I ready to fulfil. To the Pope I owe neither suit nor service : he is the great Antichrist, the son of perdition, the abomination of desolation in the holy place."

Lord Cobham¹ retired to his strong castle of Cowling, near Rochester. He treated the citations, the excommunications of the Archbishop with utter contempt, and seemed determined to assert the independence of a

¹ He was Lord Cobham by right.

bold baron, and to defend his house against all aggressors. The summoners, one after another, were repelled; letters citatory affixed on the doors of Rochester Cathedral, three miles off, were torn down and burned. The Summoner at length found his way into the castle accompanied by a King's officer. To the royal officer Cobham was too prudent or too loyal to offer resistance. He was committed to the Tower. There (perhaps shortly before) he published a full confession of his belief. Its language was calm, guarded, conciliatory. If the Clergy had chosen to be satisfied, they might have been satisfied. Cobham was again admitted to the King's presence. He offered one hundred knights as his compurgators. He offered wager of battle; he would fight for life or death with Christian or heathen, on the quarrel of his faith, saving the King and his Counsellors.¹

But Arundel was determined to crush his antagonist. He admitted that Cobham's confession contained much which was good. Articles were framed declaring Transubstantiation in its grossest form, the absolute annihilation of the material bread and wine; Confession in the most rigid terms, obedience to the hierarchy, the worship of images, and pilgrimages. Cobham was arraigned before the Primate, the Bishops of London and Winchester (the Bishop of Bangor joined the tribunal), with a number of Doctors of the Canon and Civil Law.² The Archbishop's language was mild, his

¹ It is said, but most improbably, that he appealed from the Archbishop to the Pope.

² During the search for Wycliffe's writings, which were publicly burned at Paul's Cross, a book was found at a limner's, where it had been left to be illuminated, belonging to Oldcastle. The King read a few pages, and

purpose stern and inflexible. Cobham knelt down and spake: "Many have been my crimes against man; for the breaking of God's commandments they never cursed me, for breaking their laws and traditions I and others are thus cruelly entreated." He was committed, and appeared a second time in the Dominican convent. He was submitted to a long, weary, intricate, scholastic cross-examination. He gradually lost his calm self-command. The suppressed enthusiasm burst out into a wild prophetic denunciation of the Pope and the Prelates. He denounced the wealth of the Church as the venom of the Church. "What meanest thou," said Arundel, "by venom?" "Your possessions and your lordships. Then cried an angel in the air, as your own chronicles witness: 'Woe, woe, woe! this day is venom poured into the Church of God.' Since that day Pope hath put down Pope; one has poisoned, one has cursed, one has slain another. Consider ye this, all men. Christ was meek and merciful; the Pope haughty and a tyrant. Christ was poor and forgave; the Pope is rich and a homicide. Rome is the nest of Antichrist: out of that nest come his disciples. The Prelates, the Priests, the Monks are the body; these shaven Friars the tail." "That is uncharitably spoken," said the Prior of the Augustines. The blood of Cobham was on fire; he went on in his fierce declamation. He soon resumed his calm courage, and argued with close precision. After his sentence, he said: "Though ye judge my body, ye have no power over my soul." He knelt and prayed for his

declared that he had never read such dangerous doctrines. Oldcastle owned the book to be his property, but asserted that he had read only two or three pages of it, and could not be answerable for its contents.

enemies. He was condemned, adjudged a heretic, and committed to the Tower.¹

He made his escape from the Tower, and from that time became an object of terror to the government, who dreaded a general rising of the Lollards under a man of such known intrepidity, valor, and military science. Rumors of conspiracies, of insurrections, of designs on the person of the King, spread abroad. A royal proclamation, subsequently issued, accused the Lollards of a deliberate, wide-spread plot to destroy the hierarchy, to suppress all monasteries, to confiscate the estates of the Church, to proclaim Cobham Protector of the realm. Cobham is said to have instigated a Scottish invasion.²

It must be remembered that the title of Henry V. was at this time by no means generally acknowledged; his throne not secure. Reports that Richard II. was still alive in Scotland were credited by many; the elder line of Lionel Duke of Clarence (as appears by the conspiracy of the Earl of Cambridge, Scrope, and Grey of Heton, during the next year) had its partisans. Henry was known, till the battle of Agincourt, only as a wild and dissolute, if gallant, generous, and active youth, accused of having designed to seize his father's crown in his lifetime. The lower orders, till they were intoxicated into loyalty by the French conquests, cherished the memory of Richard II., hated the usurper, loved not his main support, the Church. The levelling doctrines of the peasant insurgents under Richard cannot have been entirely crushed. Of the more fanatic Lollards some may have embraced those

¹ Fox. The sentence passed by Arundel may be read.

² Walsingham.

tenets. The whole sect may have begun to madden into despair at this close and manifest alliance between the Lancastrian Kings and the hierarchy. It is not improbable that wild schemes may have been formed, it is certain that they were dreaded and suspected.

The King, with his bold military decision, suddenly moved from his palace at Eltham, in which it had been rumored that the conspirators were preparing to surprise him and put him to death. He appeared in Westminster. Immediately, St. Giles's Fields, the place of assembly, as it was bruited abroad, for the whole host of the Lollards, was on a sudden surrounded by the royal troops. It was given out, that in the dusk of that very evening, or in the night, countless armed men were seen creeping along the lanes and under the hedges to the place of rendezvous. A few persons were seized, Sir Roger Acton, Sir John Browne, and J. Burnley, a rector. Their excuse was that they came to hear Burnley preach. From others was extorted a confession that they expected the Lord Cobham. The King had ordered the City gates to be closed, for it was further rumored that 50,000 servants and apprentices were prepared to sally forth.

No outbreak took place; there was not the least commotion or resistance. Nine and thirty persons were instantly put on trial and executed.¹ Confessions, whether voluntary or extorted, true or false, were an-

¹ The meeting was on the night of the 7th Jan. (Sunday). Was a preaching to take place? was it to cover the movements of the conspirators? or was it a pretext seized by the government? On Monday (8th) the prisoners had been taken and sent to jail. The bill was preferred against the 27 (or 39) prisoners on the 9th. On that day and the 10th, all, including three peers, were tried and condemned for treason and heresy. On the 12th they were executed. Compare House of Lancaster, note xxviii.

nounced, of the vast and formidable conspiracy. After the execution, a new and violent Statute was passed for the suppression of Lollards.

The royal proclamation and the indictment of Oldcastle Lord Cobham, Sir Roger Acton, and others, announced to the nation, which had hardly time for amazement and terror from the rapidity of the King's movements, the menaced insurrection, the secret conspiracy, the gathering together of the conspirators, the 20,000 men said to be ready in arms. It declared their object to have been the utter abolition of the State, the abrogation of the office of Prelate, the suppression of all religious orders, the slaying of our Lord the King, his brothers, the Prelates, and other nobles of the realm; the proscription of all monks and friars, the despoiling and destruction of all Cathedral churches, of many other churches and holy monasteries; they designed to raise Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, to be Regent of the realm.¹

How far were the fears of the government real? On what were they grounded? How far was the proclamation intended to strike terror into the Lollards and their abettors, to arouse the hatred of all loyal subjects and lovers of order against them? The whole was an affair of four days: the pretended insurrection, its suppression, the trial, the execution of at least between twenty and thirty men, some of high rank.² And

¹ The indictment is in Fox. "Et dictum Johannem Oldcastle regentem ejusdem regni constituere, et quamplurima regimina secundum eorum voluntatem intra regnum prædictum quasi gens sine capite in finalem destructionem fidei Catholicæ et cleri, quam status et majestatis dignitatis regal. infra idem regnum ordinare."

² In the Close Rolls at this time appears an entry: "To John Maihewe and others, his companion jurors upon an inquest held for the King at Westminster upon certain traitors and rebels against the King's person,

where all this time was the terrible and mysterious Cobham? Of his agency, still less of his presence, there is neither proof nor vestige. It is only known that he was proscribed; that for three years he lay concealed from all the keen bloodhounds who were induced to trace him by honest hatred of his treasons, by the baser hope of favor or reward.

At the end of this period (yet this is but a doubtful rumor) he suddenly appeared near St. Albans. If accidental, this apparition was singularly ill-timed. It was during an invasion of the Scots, with whom he had before been charged as being in secret correspondence. Again he was lost to the keen sight alike of his admirers and his enemies. At length he was taken, after a vigorous resistance, by Sir Edward Charlton, Lord of Powis. Such importance was attached to his arrest, that Charlton received 1000 marks as reward.

Cobham suffered at once the punishment of a traitor and a heretic. This punishment was inflicted in St. Giles's Fields, with all the blended barbarity of both modes of execution. He was hung on a gallows, with a fire at his feet, and slowly consumed. He was said to have declared himself a faithful subject of his liege Lord, Richard II., thus avouching, as though in secret intelligence with the Scots, the wild tale, unquestionably current, that Richard was still living in that kingdom. These and other strange rumors rest on slight authority. His conduct was throughout (this we would believe more fully) that of a noble

Death of
Cobham,
1417.

the money paid by the hands of the said John in discharge of 6*l.*, which the Lord the King ordered them of his gift, by writ 6*l.*: also for a breakfast to others, including the Lord Mayor, 2*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.*." There is another to Thomas Burton (the King's spy), for watching the Lollards, 100 shillings.

religious man. Before his execution he fell on his knees, and implored forgiveness on his enemies. He addressed the multitude in a few words, urging them to obey the law of God in the Scripture, to reject all evil in their lives. He refused the aid of a priest: "to God only, now as ever present, he would confess, and of him entreat pardon." His last words, drowned by the crackling flames, were praise of God. The people wept and prayed with him; they heard in contemptuous silence the declarations of the priests, that Cobham died an enemy of God, an heretic to the Church.¹

We have followed English Wycliffism to the martyrdom of Lord Cobham. It is singular that it was not in a Teutonic but a Slavonian kingdom, not in a language kindred to the English, but in one of a totally different stock, dissonant in most of its words and ideas, that the opinions of Wycliffe were to be received with eager zeal, and propagated with cordial acceptance. In Bohemia, the Reformer's works — jealously watched, trampled under foot, burned by the hierarchy — were received, multiplied, translated, honored as the exposition of the true and genuine Gospel. The apostles, the heirs, of Wycliffism, were John Huss and Jerome of Prague; we must return to Constance to witness their influence, their death-defying strength, their inextinguishable vitality: the death of Huss preceded that of Cobham two years.

¹ Though rapid in my relation, I have been slow, if I may so say, faltering, in all this history of Cobham. All is obscure and contradictory, especially the St. Giles's Fields insurrection. To all Roman Catholic writers Oldcastle is a turbulent, dangerous rebel, as well as a heretic; to Protestants, a loyal subject, as well as a martyr. The authorities are heaped together, but require most diligent and suspicious sifting, in Fox.

CHAPTER VIII.

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

THROUGHOUT Christendom all eyes, all minds were centred on the German city of Constance. There for the first time was to meet the great Universal Council, the representative assembly of Latin Christianity. The older Œcumenic Councils had been Eastern and Greek, with a few, a very few, delegates from the West. The more famous Latin Councils, as those of the Lateran, of Vienne, of Lyons, were assemblages of prelates, whom the Pope condescended to summon, in order to take counsel with him, and under him, on the affairs of the Church. The Council of Pisa had been hardly more than a college of Cardinals, with the advice and support of certain Prelates and ambassadors of sovereign princes. The Council of Constance assumed more than the power of judging on the claims of rival Pontiffs; the supremacy of the Pope over a General Council, of a General Council over the Pope, was now an inevitable question. The Council placed itself at once above the three contesting Popes, each with a doubtful and disputed title; each with some part, though but a small part, of Christendom adhering to his obedience. If such a Council, sweeping away these ignoble rivals, might create a new successor of St. Peter, they might impose conditions and limit his autoc-

rary. Who could foresee the power which they would assume, the power which they would have the ambition, the strength to exercise? Nor was the one absorbing paramount question the election of the Pope: it was not only from its anarchy but its sunken state that the Church must be vindicated and reëstablished; the reformation of the Church in its head and in all its members, was among the avowed objects, it was the special function, of the Council; the maintenance of the unity of the Church against formidable heresiarchs; the suppression of heresies, which had ceased to be those of rebellious sects, had become those of rebellious nations. In Constance would be seen of the monarchs of Christendom perhaps one only, but he the greatest, the Emperor, who stood higher than any successor of Charlemagne since the Othos, the Fredericks, or Rodolph of Hapsburg. But there might be three Pontiffs, each of whom had worn, each boasted himself the rightful wearer of the Papal tiara. There would certainly be the whole College of Cardinals; the most famous and learned churchmen from every kingdom of the West; even those dreaded heresiarchs, the heirs and successors of the English Wycliffe, who had nearly severed the kingdom of Bohemia from Latin Christendom.

In June the quiet streets of ancient Constance were disturbed by the first preparations for the A.D. 1414. great drama which was to be performed within her walls. The Bishop elect of Augsburg and Count Eberhard of Nellenberg entered the city to choose quarters for the Emperor. Hopes began to spread, to strengthen, that the high contracting parties were in earnest; that the Universal Council, so often an-

nounced, so often eluded, would at length take place. In August came the Cardinal of Viviers, the Bishop of Ostia, with a distinguished suite, to take order for the accommodation of the Pope John XXIII. and of his Cardinals. From that period to the Feast of All Saints, the day named for the opening of the Council, and for several months after, the converging roads which led to this central city were crowded with all ranks and orders, ecclesiastics and laymen, Sovereign Princes, and Ambassadors of Sovereigns, Archbishops and Bishops, the heads or representatives of the great Monastic Orders, theologians, doctors of Canon or of Civil Law, delegates from renowned Universities, some with splendid and numerous retainers, some like trains of pilgrims, some singly and on foot. With these, merchants, traders of every kind and degree, and every sort of wild and strange vehicle. It was not only, it might seem, to be a solemn Christian Council, but an European congress, a vast central fair, where every kind of commerce was to be conducted on the boldest scale, and where chivalrous or histrionic or other common amusements were provided for idle hours and for idle people. It might seem a final and concentrated burst and manifestation of mediæval devotion, mediæval splendor, mediæval diversions: all ranks, all orders, all pursuits, all professions, all trades, all artisans, with their various attire, habits, manners, language, crowded to one single city.

On the steep slope of the Alps were seen winding down, now emerging from the autumn-tinted chestnut groves, now lost again, the rich cavalcades of the Cardinals, the Prelates, the Princes of Italy, each with their martial guard or their ecclesiastical pomp. The blue

spacious lake was studded with boats and barks, conveying the Bishops and Abbots, the knights and grave burghers, of the Tyrol, of Eastern and Northern Germany, Hungary, and from the Black Forest and Thuringia. Along the whole course of the Rhine, from Cologne, even from Brabant, Flanders, or the farthest North, from England and from France, marched Prelates, Abbots, Doctors of Law, celebrated Schoolmen, following the upward course of the stream, and gathering as they advanced new hosts from the provinces and cities to the east or west. Day after day the air was alive with the standards of Princes, and the banners emblazoned with the armorial bearings of Sovereigns, of Nobles, of Knights, of Imperial Cities ; or glittered with the silver crozier, borne before some magnificent Bishop or mitred Abbot. Night after night the silence was broken by the pursuivants and trumpeters announcing the arrival of some high and mighty Count or Duke, or the tinkling mule-bells of some lowlier caravan. The streets were crowded with curious spectators, eager to behold some splendid prince or ambassador, some churchman famous in the pulpit, in the school, in the council, it might be in the battle-field, or even some renowned minnesinger, or popular jongleur. The city almost appeared to enlarge itself to welcome week after week the gathering strangers. The magistrates had taken admirable measures to maintain order. Every one seemed to glide into and settle down in his proper place. Everywhere were gathering crowds, yet no tumult : among these crowds now a low deep murmur, now a hush of expectation, no clamor, no confusion, no quarrel, no riot. Constance might seem determined to support her dignity, as chosen for a kind

of temporary capital of Christendom. The awfulness of the great subjects which were to be discussed had, as it were, intralled the mind of man to a calm seriousness; even amusements and diversions were under sober discipline. Whatever there was, and doubtless there was much, of gross and licentious, was kept out of sight.

Of all those vast multitudes there was no one whose fate might seem so to tremble on the balance; who could look on this wonderful scene with such profound emotions of hope and fear; to whom the Council was at once so full of awe, yet at the same time, to his yet unextinguished ambition, might eventually prove such a scene of pride, of triumph, as John XXIII. The Pope had every imaginable guarantee, notwithstanding some dubious words,¹ not only for his person, but for his dignity. His right, in concurrence with the Emperor, to summon the Council had been admitted by Sigismund. The Imperial Edict asserted his plenary jurisdiction; the magistrates of Constance had taken a solemn oath on the direct demand of the Emperor, to receive him with all befitting honors as the one true Pope, to protect him to the utmost, to give him free liberty to enter, to remain, or to depart from their city.² He was to have entire independent authority over his own court: his safe-conduct was to be respected by all the officers of the city.

Yet had the Pope, notwithstanding all these solemn

¹ "Ne exinde occasionem non veniendi habeat." Such is the suspicious language of Sigismund.

² "Ita quod semper et omni tempore, licebit ei stare in dictâ civitate et ab eâ recedere, non obstante quocunque impedimento." See the oath in Von der Hardt, l. v. p. 5. The Emperor's stipulations to the Pope were not of much more value than those to John Huss.

guarantees, notwithstanding his wealth, and the array of Cardinals attached, as he hoped, to his interests, with the Italian Bishops, almost in number enough to overrule the Council,¹ strong and sad misgivings. He sought to make friends in every quarter in his hour of need. Frederick, Duke of Austria, was the hereditary enemy of the House of Luxemburg. His territories almost surrounded the city of Constance; his strong castles crowned many of the hills around, which might be seen from the borders of the lake; the Tyrol and the Black Forest were among his possessions. Frederick, as if to show the utmost respect to the Pope, met him at Trent. The Pope was lavish of honors, gifts, and promises. At Meran he named the Austrian Gonfalonier of the Church, and of his privy council. He assigned him as stipend for these functions 6000 florins a year. Frederick, besides these advantages, looked to the support of the Pope in certain feuds with the Bishops of Trent, Coire, and Brixen. He swore fealty to the Pope; he promised all aid and protection on the road, and in the city of Constance, and to secure his free retreat from that city.² Frederick of Austria was closely allied with the Duke of Burgundy; the Duke's sister was the widow of Frederick's brother, Leopold of Austria; she resided on her dowry lands in the Austrian States. The Duke of Burgundy had strong reasons for courting the favor of the Pope. Among

¹ "Johannes venit Constantiam, cum multis Prælatiſ Italix, ut per votorum pluralitatem ſe conſervaret in Papatu." — Ebendorfer in Pez. Script. Austrix, ii. 825.

² Gerhard de Rio aſſerts, from Austrian documents, that the Pope communicated this treaty to Sigismund: probably the articles which could not be concealed; the honors and dignities conferred on the Austrian, not the ſecret ſtipulations for protection.

the causes to be judged by the Council of Constance was that of Jean Petit, whose atrocious defence of the atrocious murder of the Duke of Orleans by Burgundy or his partisans, was to be arraigned in the face of Christendom. An alliance with Austria was almost an alliance with Burgundy, now, whether on the French or English side, almost commanding France. The Marquis of Baden, too, and the Count of Nassau received significant presents from John XXIII.; and if the Emperor should show hostility to the Pope, the Pope seemed sure of a partisan in the mightiest Prelate of the empire, the Archbishop of Mentz. As John descended towards Constance he invested the Abbot of St. Ulric at Kreuzlingen with the mitre, the usual privilege of Bishops alone. Thus, even at the gates of Constance, he would secure a powerful friend.

Yet, despite all these precautions, there were dismal
Oct. 28. moments of despondency. As he came down the steep Arlberg his sledge was upset; his attendants crowded round to know if he was hurt. "In the devil's name what do I lying here?" As he wound round the last declivity, and Constance lay below in her deep valley, washed by the lake, the Pope looked down and exclaimed, "A trap for foxes."

Constance received the Pope with every sign of
Oct. 28. respect and spiritual loyalty. The magistrates and the clergy attended him through the streets, and to the venerable Minster. Nine Cardinals, about six hundred followers, formed the pompous retinue of his Holiness. The great Festival of All Saints had been named as peculiarly appropriate for the opening of the saintly Council; but from various causes, of the Prelates, except those of Italy, few had arrived.

Though the Council was opened by the Pope in person on the 5th November, the first public session was adjourned to November 16. In the mean time certain preliminaries were arranged. Twelve auditors of the Rota were named to judge ecclesiastical causes. Congregations were held to regulate the order of the sittings and to appoint officers. At one of these congregations the Pope issued his inhibition to all members of the Council that no one might depart without permission. On the 2d of December six more Cardinals had arrived; these with the nine present formed a fair College. But on the 3d another arrival caused still greater excitement. There entered the city a pale thin man, in mean attire, yet *John Huss*, escorted by three nobles of his country, with a great troop of other followers from attachment or curiosity; he came under a special safe-conduct from the Emperor, which guaranteed in the strictest and amplest terms his safe entrance and safe departure from the Imperial City. This was the famous heresiarch of Bohemia, John Huss. Nothing could be more opportune than his early arrival for the Papal policy.

The Council had been summoned for three principal objects. I. The union of the Church under one acknowledged Pope. II. The reformation of the Clergy in its head and in its members. III. The extirpation of erroneous and heretical doctrines. Other subordinate questions were to be submitted to the supreme tribunal of Christendom: the examination of Jean Petit's defence of the assassination of the Duke of Orleans, the proceedings of the Flagellants, and some less important matters. On the order in which the Council should proceed as to the three great leading

topics depended the influence, the title, perhaps the fate of the Pope. The vital question of all, not deliberately proposed, but at the root of all the other questions — the superiority of the Council to the Pope, of the Pope to the Council — might be postponed ; if postponed, eluded. This would be the case if the Council could be occupied by matter on which Pope and Council might agree, which might inflame the common passions, and direct their almost maddening zeal against one common foe, one common victim. Let, then, the suppression of heresy be the first paramount absorbing subject of debate. All precedent was in the Pope's favor ; it had ever been the first act of Œcumenic Councils, from that of Nicea, to guard the faith and to condemn heresy. So, too, the Council of Constance, commencing at this point, might be held a continuation, hardly more than a prorogation, of the Council of Pisa. And this to the Pope was life or death. For if the Council of Pisa was thus even tacitly recognized, his title among the three claimants to the Papacy, his absolute title, resting on the solemn decree of that Council, was irrefragable. Could he not, begirt with his Cardinals (their common interest might guarantee their fidelity), and with the overpowering suffrages of the Italian Prelates, centre the whole attention of the Council on this one subject ? Could he not set the whole host in full cry on the track of this quarry ? At least during this discussion he and his Italians would have been gaining a preponderating influence ; he, for months, would have been permitted to guide and rule the Council. What if he should render the signal service of condemning, still better of inducing these dreaded heresiarchs to recant, could the

ungrateful Church then cast him off? Then he would return to Italy the recognized Pope of the Council of Constance. If not, some time having been thus occupied, a thousand accidents, dissensions, plague, famine, the opportune death of some important personage, might dissipate the Council before they could enter on more dangerous ground.

Nor was this an unwarranted, ungrounded hope; the policy had every promise of success. The doctrines of Wycliffe, which Huss and his followers were accused of propagating in the villages and cities of Bohemia, even in the University of Prague, were generally odious. Those who knew least of them, looked on them with the terror of ignorance; those who knew them best saw that they struck at the root of the whole hierarchical system, in the common view the whole religion of Christ. The foremost Reformers, D'Ailly, Gerson, Zabarella, and the few Cardinals in that party, would behold perhaps with greater horror, as crossing their more moderate and sober designs, those innovators who laid their hands not on the corruptions of the Clergy only, but on their possessions, their rights, their immunities, their privileges, their spiritual powers, and even on the accredited orthodox doctrines of the faith. They, too, might be tempted to assert this suppression of heresy, which they dreaded with such profound dread, hated with such unmitigated hatred, to be the first, preliminary, inevitable duty of the great Council.

This insurrection, moreover, against the sublime autocracy of the Latin hierarchy; this appeal from the traditional Christianity of the West, the growth of ages, with all its mythology, legendary history, law,

philosophy, ritual, venerable usages, and with all its vast system of rights and obligations and its tenure of property, to the primal and simpler Christianity of the Lord and his Apostles; this first attempt to substitute for an obedience to an outward law, and to an all-embracing discipline enforced by ecclesiastical penal statute, the religion of the inward conscience, self-dependent rather than dependent on the ghostly adviser: this assertion of the freedom of thought, limited only by the boundaries of the human faculties and the plain written word of God; this dawning moral and religious revolution, though it had begun in Teutonic England, and had been first embodied in the vernacular Anglo-Saxon of Wycliffe's Bible and Tracts, and in the poetry of Langland and of Chaucer, was

Reformation not yet Teutonic. not yet taken up by the Teutonic mind. It was propagated only under most unfavorable auspices, in a remote corner of Christendom, among a nation which spoke an unformed language, intelligible to themselves alone, and not more akin to German than to Latin; a nation, as it were, intruded into the Teutonic Empire, thought barbarian, and from late circumstances held in hostile jealousy by the Teutonic commonwealth.

Bohemia was thus an insulated stranger among the German principalities, a stranger with a right of suffrage for the Imperial crown, but striving to preserve her Slavonic nationality against the Teutonic element which, from her connection with the Empire, was forcing itself into her territory, her usages, and even pressing on her language. Bohemia, too, labored under the unpopularity of having given to the Imperial throne a Sovereign, Charles IV., of whom the

German annals speak with bitter hatred and contempt, but who had been beloved, and deservedly beloved, for his wise laws, admirable institutions, and for his national policy in his native kingdom. His father, John of Bohemia, that restless chivalrous adventurer who fell at Crecy, was a German in manners and in heart; Charles a Bohemian who might seem to sacrifice the ungrateful and intractable Empire to his hereditary Kingdom. As King of Bohemia, Charles was the creator of the realm: to him she owed equal laws, sound institutions, magnificent cities, at least Prague, which Charles adorned with splendid churches, noble palaces, stately bridges, her famous University.¹

Charles IV. had at least not discouraged the first Reformers, who before the time of Huss protested in the strongest terms against the vices of the clergy, and the abuses of the Roman Court. The Prelate Conrad Strickna, during his reign, had denounced the progress of these opinions. The Reformer, Milecz von Krem-sar, was the King's Court Preacher.

The deposition of King Wenzel, the son of Charles, from the Empire by the Electors on the Rhine, was at once a sign and an aggrava-
A.D. 1400.
King Wenzel
(Wenceslaus).
 tion of the jealousy of Teutonism against
A.D. 1394.
 Bohemia. During the reign of Wenzel, a still more stirring teacher, Matthias von Zanow, had advanced the bolder axiom that it was gross superstition to reverence the edicts of the Pope on articles of faith, equally with the words of Christ and his Apostles. The Church, to resume her dignity, must be entirely re-

¹ Read the glowing description of the reign of Charles IV., in Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, ii. p. 2, p. 328, *et seq.*

newed in the spirit of the Gospel.¹ The marriage of King Wenzel's sister, Anne of Bohemia, to Richard II. of England, had brought the two realms into close connection, exactly at the time when the doctrines of Wycliffe were making their most rapid progress. The Queen herself, as has been said, was strongly impressed with the new doctrines. Bohemian scholars sat at the feet of the bold professor of theology at Oxford; English students were found at Prague. The writings of Wycliffe were brought in great numbers, some in Latin, some translated into Bohemian, and disseminated by admiring partisans.

John of Hussinetz, a Bohemian village, was a man John Huss. of eloquence and an accomplished scholar, of severe morals, but gentle, friendly, accessible to all. He became Preacher in the University chapel called Bethlehem, and Confessor to the Queen Sophia. So long as his fervid sermons denounced the vices of the world, the Clergy, the Monks and the Friars were among his most admiring hearers; but as he began to condemn the luxury, the pride, the licentiousness of the Clergy and the abuses of the Church, their admiration turned to animosity. He would have been persecuted, if he had not been protected by the Court; for such doctrines were not the less heard with favor by the Court because they were repulsive to the Clergy. The Schism in the Papacy had shaken the awe of the hierarchy to its base, and King Wenzel had strong grounds for personal hostility against that hierarchy. The Archbishop-Electors had been the leaders in the defection, the prime movers in his deposal from the Empire. The Pope, Boniface IX., had sanc-

¹ Weissenberg, ii. p. 121.

tioned their haughty proceedings. For many years, too, the sale of benefices had been so notorious by both Popes, that Wenzel in Bohemia, Sigismund in Hungary,¹ had not only prohibited the exportation of money to Rome, but had broken off all intercourse with the Papal Court.

Just at this time a scholar of John Huss² returned from his studies in Paris and Oxford: he brought many writings of Wycliffe. These writings not merely inveighed against the idleness and corruptions of the Clergy and of the Monks, but broke in at once on more perilous ground. Wycliffe had been already condemned by the Church as an heresiarch. Huss shrunk at first from the infection: he read the books with suspicion and dislike, so much so that he had nearly committed the godless volumes to the flames. He found, on more careful study, deeper and neglected truths. Still, however, much of Wycliffe's doctrine could not command his assent, but much worked by slow degrees into his mind and into his teaching.

The Archbishop Sbinko of Prague had looked on Huss with favor; he could neither be ignorant of the change in the Preacher's views, nor the cause of that change. He issued his sentence of condemnation; he threatened all who should promulgate the tenets of Wycliffe with the heretic's death, the stake. Huss was at first appalled; he was quiet for a time; but the Confessor of the Queen, and the idol of one half the University of Prague, could not long hold his peace, for he was not the champion of Wycliffe's free opinions alone, now forcing themselves into a slow popularity,

¹ Ashbach, Kaiser Sigmond, ii. 24.

² He had the ill-sounding name of Faulfisch.

but of the Bohemian against the German students; and, extraordinary as it may seem, on a subject which stirred the hearts of the scholars to as great a depth, of the Realist against the Nominalist philosophy. This strife hurried on the conflicting parties to the inevitable schism. The deposition of their King Wenzel from the Empire had wounded the Bohemian pride: they held the Germans as strangers and aliens in their national University. The German Professors had taken part with the Archbishop in the implied censure of Huss. By a singular revolution, the Realistic philosophy, which had been the sworn ally of orthodoxy, the philosophy of Lanfranc and Anselm against Abélard, of Aquinas against Ockham, had changed sides. The great French divines, Gerson, D'Ailly (perhaps partly from their French perspicacity), the Germans in general, from the more exclusive study of the Aristotelian Scholasticism, had warped round to the more rationalistic Nominalism. The University of Prague was rent with feuds; students met students, not in the schools of disputation, but in the streets and on the bridges, and fought out the battles of Churchmen and Wycliffites, of Germans and Bohemians, of Nominalists and Realists. At length the Bohemian faction, with Huss at their head, obtained from the King the abrogation of the privileges of the Germans in the votes for academic offices. The sullen Germans, and with them the Poles, abandoned the city. Of thirty thousand, a great part wandered to Leipsic, and founded a rival University.

A.D. 1409. Huss became Rector of the University of Prague. His popularity triumphed even over the interests of the citizens, which suffered severely from the departure of the German students.

Huss now preached boldly and without reserve the Wycliffite doctrines, at least as far as denunciations, not only against the corruptions, but against the wealth of the Clergy. The King heard with satisfaction the grateful maxim that the royal power was far above that of the hierarchy; the Archbishop and the Clergy were constrained to murmuring silence, while all Bohemia seemed falling off to these fearful opinions.

The Council of Pisa had uttered its sentence of deposition against Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. The Archbishop of Prague adhered to Gregory; the King, Huss, and the Bohemians to the Council. Huss was emboldened to assail the Papal power itself. The King answered to the complaints of the Archbishop, "So long as Master Huss preached against us of the world, you rejoiced, and declared that the Spirit of God spoke in him. It is now your turn." But the accession of Alexander V., whom Bohemia, having acknowledged the Council of Pisa, could not refuse to accept, gave the Archbishop courage. He obtained a Bull from the Pope for the suppression of the Wycliffite doctrines. He threatened the refractory teachers. He collected no less than two hundred writings of the odious English heresiarch, and committed them publicly to the flames; but the King compelled him to pay the value of the books to those from whom he had seized them by his arbitrary ecclesiastical power. Huss continued to preach. He appealed from the Pope to Christ himself, the one final unerring Judge: "I, John Huss, offer this appeal to Jesus Christ, my Master and my just Judge, who knows, defends, and judges the just cause."¹

¹ Opera, John Huss, i. 17. *L'Enfant*, Concile de Constance, i. p. 33.

The pious Alexander was succeeded by Balthasar Cossa, John XXIII. Among the first acts of Pope John was a citation to John Huss, the man of irreproachable morals, to appear before the tribunal of a Pope charged at least with every imaginable crime. The Bohemian King, and the nation would not permit Huss to cross the Alps; they alleged fear of his German enemies; a pompous embassy of three theologians appeared in his stead. The Archbishop, from prudence or more generous feeling, received from Huss a confession of faith, with which he declared himself satisfied. He announced to the Roman Court that heresy no longer contaminated his diocese.

No answer came from Rome, but there came the vendors of indulgences for the war of the Pope against King Ladislaus of Naples. The vendors abstained from none of those insolent exaggerations of the value of their wares which were so obnoxious to sounder piety. Huss broke out in a torrent of eloquent indignation. His scholar, Jerome Faulfisch, burned the Bull of Indulgences under the gallows. The preachers of the Indulgences were exposed to insult, outrage, persecution. The magistrates interfered; some rioters were seized and executed; the people rose; the town-house was stormed; the remains of the rioters taken up and venerated as relics. News arrived that the ambassadors of Huss, of the University, and of the King, had been thrown into prison at Rome; that Huss was under the ban of excommunication, Prague under interdict. The timid King shrunk from the contest. Huss withdrew for a time from the city, but only by his eloquent preachings all over the country to influence now not Prague alone, but all Bohemia, with

indignation against the abuses of the hierarchy. His writings, some in Latin, some in his native dialect, spread with rapidity. If in these he maintained some prudent or perhaps indeterminate ambiguity on the established doctrines, he struck boldly at all the bearings of those doctrines on Papal and on priestly authority.

John Huss then was no isolated teacher, no follower of a condemned English heretic: he was more even than head of a sect; he almost represented a kingdom, no doubt much more than half of Bohemia. King Wenzel and his Queen were on his side, at least as against the Clergy.

The Emperor Sigismund aspired to restore peace to the Church. The Council of Constance had Why Huss appeared at Constance. been summoned to reform the Church in its head and in its members; its proclaimed object was the extirpation of all abuses throughout Christendom. It was not for Huss to stand aloof in fear or suspicion. He had appealed to a Council. If his opinions were just and true, he could not shrink from bringing their justice and truth before a Council which comprehended not the high dignitaries alone, but also the most consummate theologians of Christendom. As yet, however some of his opinions might seem to lean to speculative Wycliffitism, he was, like others of great name, avowedly no more than an ardent reformer of abuses. He obtained from the University of Prague, from the Estates of Bohemia, from Conrad Archbishop of Prague, and even from Nicolas Bishop of Nazareth, the Grand Inquisitor, testimonials to his orthodoxy and irreproachable life. Yet he was not, he could not be, without dark misgivings. He left a letter only to be opened in case of his death at Constance: it contained

his last will and his confession.¹ His valedictory address to his followers enjoined them to maintain their faith, to pray earnestly for his safe return. "He expected to meet as many enemies at Constance as our Lord at Jerusalem — the wicked Clergy, and even some secular Princes, and those Pharisees the Monks."

The fame of Huss travelled before him: curiosity or interest in his doctrines triumphed over the German aversion to the Bohemian. In many towns he held conferences even with the clergy, and parted from them on amicable terms. At Nuremburg he was met by three Bohemian nobles, who bore from Spiers the Imperial safe-conduct, couched in the strictest and fullest terms, guaranteeing his safe entrance and his safe return from Constance.² John of Chlum, Wenzel of Duba, Henry of Lazenbach, were charged to watch and keep guard over their countryman, who travelled under the special protection of the Emperor.

Not many days after the arrival of the Pope, John Huss, as has been said, entered Constance. He was graciously received by the Pope himself. Nothing was said of the ban of excommunication which still hung over him: it is doubtful whether it was not legally annulled by his reception before the Pope. Strong expressions are attributed to the Pope: "If he had slain my brother, I would not permit, as far as is in my power, any harm to be done to him in Con-

¹ Among the sins that burdened his conscience was playing at chess and losing his temper when beaten.

² The safe-conduct may be seen in many publications. *L'Enfant, Von der Hardt*; the latest and perhaps most accurate version in *Aschbach, Kaiser Sigmund*, ii. 29.

Huss sets
out for
Constance.
Oct. 21.

stance.”¹ The Pope, on whom religion hung so loosely, may not have had that deep aversion for, he may not fully have comprehended, the bearing of the Wycliffite tenets; still less could he comprehend the stern, stubborn conscientiousness which would not swerve from, and which would boldly assert such opinions in the face of danger or death. Noble religious fanaticism has constantly baffled the reckoning of the most profound worldly sagacity. He might fondly suppose the possibility of the Bohemian’s submission to Papal arguments, impressed by Papal majesty; and the submission of so famous a heretic to his milder admonitions would give him overweening weight in the Council. But with the more keen-eyed and inflexible Italian Cardinals, Huss was only a barbarian and a heretic. They could not but discern (for they had nothing to blind their instinct) the vital oppugnancy of his views to the hierarchical system. Huss himself could not remain in modest and inoffensive privacy. Partisans, admirers, would crowd around him; his zeal would not permit him in base timidity to shrink from the avowal of his creed, whether by preaching in his house or among his followers. The Bishop of Constance admonished him, but in vain, and forbade his celebrating Mass while yet unabsolved.

The arrival of Stephen Palecz and Michael de Causis, the bitter and implacable adversaries of Huss, with whom he had been involved in fierce controversy, changed the suspended state of affairs. These men stood forward openly as his accusers: they swept away

¹ “Etiam si Johannes Huss fratrem sibi germanum occidisset, se tamen nullo modo commissurum, quantum in ipso situm est, ut aliqua ei fiat injuria, quamdiu Constantiæ esset.” — Von der Hardt, iv. p. 11.

all the fairer, milder, or more subtle interpretations by which Huss reconciled his own doctrines with the orthodox creed, especially as regarded the clergy. Huss had declared wicked Popes, wicked Cardinals, wicked Prelates, to be utterly without authority, their excommunications void, their administration of the Sacraments as only to be valid by some nice distinction. Palecz and De Causis cast all these maxims in their naked, unmitigated offensiveness before the indignant hierarchy. Huss was summoned, yet by a deputation which still showed respect, the Bishops of Augsburg and Trent, to appear before the Consistory of the Pope and Cardinals. He obeyed, protesting, nevertheless, that he came to render account to the Council, not to the Consistory. The charges of heresy were read. Huss quietly declared that he had rather die than be justly condemned as a heretic. "If convinced of error, he would make full recantation." He retired, but his lodging was encircled from that time by watchful sentinels.¹ A monk was let loose upon him, to ensnare him with dangerous questions. Huss had the shrewdness to detect in the monk, who affected the utmost simplicity, one of the subtlest theologians of the day.

Four weeks after his arrival at Constance, notwithstanding his appeal to the Imperial safe-conduct, notwithstanding the protest of his noble Bohemian protector, John de Chlum, Huss was committed to prison in the Bishop's palace. To De Chlum

Huss in
prison.

¹ Aschbach (p. 30) here inserts the attempt of Huss at flight, which the two authors (perhaps they are but one authority), Reichenthal and the author in D'Achery, assign to a much later period. To my judgment, Aschbach's view is utterly improbable; and on such points Reichenthal, who does not care much for religious questions, is worthy of full confidence.

the Pope protested that it was done without his authority. The Pope might find it expedient to disclaim such an act. A congregation was summoned to hear eight articles promoted by the Bohemian, Michael de Causis, against John Huss. Three Commissioners had been named by the Pope. A more numerous Commission of Cardinals, Bishops, and Doctors was appointed to conduct the inquiry. From his first prison he was conducted to a closer and more safe one in the Dominican Convent.¹ There he fell ill, and was attended by the Pope's physicians. He recovered, and in his prison wrote several works, which were eagerly dispersed among his brethren.

John de Chlum took bold and active measures for the release of Huss. He communicated this insolent violation of the Imperial safe-conduct to Sigismund, who was on his way from his coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle. The Emperor broke out into wrath: he gave orders, that if the Pope and Cardinals did not obey his mandate, the doors of the prison should be opened by force. But no one ventured to invade the Dominican cloister, and the Council yet respected the ordinances of the Pope and Cardinals. De Chlum affixed writings on all the church-doors in Constance, declaring, in strong language, the imprisonment of Huss to be an outrage against the Emperor; that all who had presumed to violate the Imperial safe-conduct, and still presumed to resist the demands of the Imperial Ambassador for his release, would be called to account.

So far, even up to the arrival of the Emperor, Pope John had maintained uncontested supremacy in the Council. His Bull had been read at the first Session,

¹ *L'Enfant*, i. p. 64.

as the authority for its proceedings. Zabarella, the all-honored Cardinal of Florence, in his opening speech, assumed throughout the presidency of the Pope. The Pope named all the offices, and distributed the functions which were submitted to and accepted by the Council. One incident alone threatened his sole dignity. The Archbishop of Ragusa, and other legates of Gregory XII., had made their entrance. On the same night the Archbishop affixed over the gates of his lodging the Papal arms of Gregory XII., with the keys and the triple crown. John resisted this daring invasion in the name of a Pope deposed by the Council of Pisa. The Council, after some stormy debate, pronounced in favor of the Pope, thus again recognizing the acts of the Council of Pisa. The obnoxious arms disappeared.

On Christmas Eve tidings arrived that Sigismund, now having received the Imperial crown at Aix-la-Chapelle, had reached Oberlingen, on the northern shore of the lake. Before morning-dawn he entered Constance. Among his first acts was attendance at the Mass. The Emperor, according to usage, in the dalmatic of a deacon, read the Gospel—the Gospel which sounded ominous in the ears of the Pope: “There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus.” The sermon preached three days after by Peter d’Ailly, Cardinal of Cambray, must at times have sent a cold shudder of dismay to the heart of John. The text was, “There shall be signs in the Sun, and in the Moon, and in the Stars:” a text literally applicable to the last advent of Christ, spiritually to his advent in an Œcumenic Council. The Sun was the spiritual power, the Pope; the Moon the temporal, the Emperor; the

Stars the Cardinals, Prelates, and Doctors in the firmament of the Council. But the Sun, for the plenitude of his power, must fulfil certain conditions. If the supreme Pastor shall have risen by bad means, by unjust and reprobate ambition; if he shall have led a scandalous and dishonest life; if he shall have ruled negligently or tyrannically, he is but the phantom of a sun. "Oh! that the Omnipotent Trinity would dash down these three statues in the Sun's house, the Church of Rome. . . . The Holy Trinity of the Divine Persons is not more adorable than a trinity of Popes abominable." But the lofty churchman kept the Moon, the temporal power, in its due subordination. To the Emperor himself he uttered no words but those of high honor; "yet the Imperial power must not think to preside in the Council, but to execute her decrees." The Council, he distinctly avers, derived its legitimate authority from being summoned by the Pope; but once met, its power was above the Pope. St. James, in the first Great Council in the Acts, did not publish its decrees in the name of St. Peter, but in that of the Council. "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."¹

There was no outward disturbance in the seeming amity between the Emperor and the Pope; they appeared together in public; all was mutual deference and respect. The Pope knew the necessities of the Emperor. The great weakness of the Empire was the utter inadequacy of the Imperial revenues to the dignity of the station. The more magnificent or ambi-

1 "Ubi non ait, placuit Petro, sed placuit nobis collectis in unum; et sequitur, 'Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis.'" — Read the sermon, in Von der Hardt, i. 436, 450.

tious the Emperor, the more difficult, often degrading, was the struggle with his narrow finances. Sigismund aspired to be amongst the most splendid of sovereigns; his enemies scoffed at the mean artifices to which he was reduced to maintain that splendor. The Pope made a skilful attempt to avail himself of his weakness; he offered him a grant, or donative, or subsidy of 200,000 florins. But Sigismund was too deeply pledged, too resolutely determined; he had set his fame on the union and reform of the Church. He could not but refuse the tempting lure.¹ From the lordly prelates of Germany he might easily raise such a sum.

The Council at first had been hardly more than an assemblage of Italian Cardinals and Prelates; it had filled gradually, but rapidly, from all parts of Europe. The first to appear before the arrival of the Emperor had been the Cardinal of Cambray, Peter d'Ailly, accompanied by many French Prelates; others came soon after. The Cardinal of Cambray took the lead of all the Transalpine Prelates, as Zabarella, Cardinal of Florence, of the Italian. All the rest did homage to their superior learning, abilities, and virtues. It was not till three months afterwards that the more learned and not less pious Chancellor Gerson appeared at the head of the deputies from the University of Paris. The French prelates and divines formed, in modern phrase, the constitutional party: they adhered with the

¹ Sigismund came "mit Warnung, er soll, von Johann die 200,000 Gulden ja nicht nehmen: diese Summa könne man von den reichen Bischöfen Deutschlands leicht bekommen." — J. Müller, Geschichte von Schweiz, aus Handschriften der Bibliothek von Wien. John de Monterolis, a bitter enemy of Sigismund, ascribes his hostility to John to the Pope's refusal of this sum. John was not likely to refuse it. — Apud Martene et Durand, t. ii. p. 1444.

severest orthodoxy to the Catholic doctrines ; they admitted the supremacy of the Pope, but not an absolute autocracy. That supremacy was limited, not only by the College of Cardinals, but by the universal voice of the Church. A General Council was above the Pope. Beyond this the Church of France stood on some of her peculiar rights and privileges, which the Pope could not infringe or abrogate. There was a law and prerogative superior to the Pope. The Gallican Church is already asserting her liberties ; her antagonism is hardly yet on distinct or defined grounds, but still it is antagonism. And all this bold assertion of superiority or independence was while a lunatic was on the throne of France ; while Henry of England was in the heart of the land, one year before the battle of Agincourt.

The English, at least Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, the representative of their Church The English. and of the insular character, were likewise as Robert Hallam. yet rigidly attached to the old traditional faith. With him the Teutonic independence of thought had not advanced farther than the strong impatience, which had long brooded in England, of the Papal tyranny, and its encroachment on the power of the State and of the nation. Throughout Hallam was the right hand of the Emperor, as asserting the civil supremacy. He alone took a high moral tone : to him a wicked Pope was but a wicked man. There was an unconscious Wycliffism in the Bishop, who would perhaps hardly have hesitated to have burned Wycliffe himself.

The powerful hierarchy of Germany did not hold its proper rank in the Council of Constance. Germans. Of the three great electoral prelaties, Cologne was vacant and contested. Treves was still in the obedi-

ence of Gregory XII.¹ Mentz appeared, but Archbishop John of Nassau was more fitted to shine in a camp than in a Council. He entered Constance at the head of a splendid and numerous retinue, in military attire, with helmet, cuirass, and boots of iron. His jealousy of the Emperor attached him recklessly to the cause of Pope John. The more remote kingdoms, Prussia, Poland, Hungary, sent their Archbishops, Posen, Riga, Gnesen, Colocz, and Canitz. There were two Danish Bishops, Kypen and Schleswig.

The total number of Clergy, not perhaps all present at one time,² was four Patriarchs, Constantinople, Grado, Antioch, Aquileia; twenty-nine Cardinals, Italians by birth, excepting five Frenchmen, chiefly of the creation of Benedict XIII., and one Portuguese; thirty-three Archbishops; about one hundred and fifty Bishops,³ including thirty-two titulars; one hundred and thirty-four Abbots; two hundred and fifty Doctors; one hundred and twenty-five Provosts, and other superiors. With their whole attendance the Clergy amounted to eighteen thousand.

If the German hierarchy were less fully or rather less effectively represented, Germany alone sent her Princes to this Diet-Council, the Prince Palatine, Louis of Heidelberg, the Dukes Louis and Henry of Bavaria. The Palatine headed the embassy of France. The Burgraves John and Frederick of Nuremburg, the latter Margrave of Brandenburg; Rodolf, Elector of Saxony, the Margrave of Baden.

¹ Cologne and Treves were, it seems, present by deputy.

² The numbers vary, perhaps on that account.

³ The English Bishops were Bath, Hereford, Salisbury, Bangor, later, Winchester, London, Lichfield, Norwich.

All the great Free Cities sent their deputies. Over their doors the arms of their cities were ostentatiously displayed, as taking rank among sovereigns.¹

Ordinarily 50,000, at certain periods at least 100,000 persons and 30,000 horses were kept in ease and plenty; 30,000 beds were provided by the city. Four Imperial Commissioners regulated the price of provisions, which throughout were abundant, and at moderate cost. The police regulations were excellent; the garrison was but of 2000 men; to the last, as at first, no disturbance, no riot took place during the Council. This is the universal testimony.

¹ See Reichenthal (Augsburg, 1483) reprinted in later collections, a kind of King-at-arms. He has left a chronicle of what may be called the State proceedings. See on Reichenthal, *L'Enfant*, Preface, p. xxxii.

CHAPTER IX.

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE. JOHN XXIII. JOHN HUSS.

POPE JOHN opened the year with a magnificent religious ceremony; he appeared amid the assembled myriads in the most solemn function of the Church as the acknowledged head of Christendom, almost for the last time! The sermon of the Cardinal of Cambray had not been the only sign of the danger that was looming over him. In the first General Congregation the Emperor had solemnly sworn to take the Pope under his sovereign protection.¹ So far the Pope and the Cardinals had heard with satisfaction; but he also avowed his expectation that the Legates of the two rival Pontiffs would be admitted to the Council. This was to sever the link which bound the Council of Constance to the Council of Pisa; it disclaimed the authority of Pisa if it recognized as Popes those who had been there deposed. A Parisian divine, Matthew Roder, had delivered a sermon in which he suggested the election of a new Pontiff.²

But that act of the Emperor, which might seem least connected with the fate of Pope John, was in fact no doubt to his own sagacity, at once the direst omen and the immediate cause of his fall. The Emperor

¹ Von der Hardt, iv. p. 31.² L'Enfant, i. p. 79.

Threatening
signs against
Pope John.
Dec. 29.

consented to violate his own safe-conduct, to abandon John Huss. The Bohemian was, with the ^{The Emperor} consent of Sigismund, committed to closer ^{abandons} John Huss. custody. It was understood that he was to be tried by the Council, doomed by the Council, and that whatever might be the sentence of the Council, it would be carried into execution by the secular arm. The Council was thus relieved from all further debate on that question: it was out of the way of their ulterior proceedings; the rock on which they might have split was avoided; their onward course was straight, clear, open.

Breach of faith admits no excuse; perfidy is twice perfidious in an Emperor. Yet it is but justice to Sigismund fairly to state the inextricable difficulty of his position. He had to choose between the violation of faith to one whom he himself no doubt esteemed a dangerous and turbulent heretic, and, it might be, the dissolution of the Council. With the Council he abandoned all the hopes on which he had rested his fame, his influence, his authority, the restoration of peace to the Church, the reformation of the Church. Huss was already arraigned as a heretic; the Pope, the Cardinals, the Council, had committed themselves to that arraignment. According to the view of almost the whole hierarchy, and the prelates of every nation, the suppression of heresy was their first imperious duty: it was the deepest and most passionate vow of every high-churchman; and which of them on such a point was not a high-churchman? Arguments were ready, which, on the principles dominant and long admitted in those days, it was not easy to parry or confute. The Emperor had no right to protect heretics, over whom throughout the world, and in every part of it, the hierarchy, especially

such a council of the hierarchy, had indefeasible cognizance, could proceed, and were bound to proceed, according to the canons of the Church. And the fatal doctrine, confirmed by long usage, by the decrees of Pontiffs, by the assent of all ecclesiastics, and the acquiescence of the Christian world, that no promise, no oath, was binding to a heretic, had hardly been questioned, never repudiated.

Had Sigismund with a high hand released the prisoner ; had he in the slightest degree infringed on the recognized province of the hierarchy, their sole adjudication in causes of heresy, Pope John might either have lengthened out an interminable discussion, or, if he had broken up the Council, or left it himself, he would have carried with him probably all the Italian Cardinals, and thrown an irreconcilable schism among the rest of the prelates. He would have become the champion of a great cause, a popular cause with the whole hierarchy, and with all under the immediate influence of the hierarchy.

Sigismund yielded, perhaps not without self-reproach, certainly not without remonstrance which must have galled a man of his high feeling to the quick. The Bohemian lords, the Burgrave of Prague and others, had already written a strong demand, which arrived about this time, for the liberty of John Huss. He had been proclaimed, as they averred, by Conrad Archbishop of Prague, under his seal, guiltless of the slightest word of heresy. A second still more vigorous protest had followed, on his removal from the Dominican Convent, against this flagrant violation of public faith. "They would deeply grieve if they should hear that his august Majesty was polluted by such an enor-

mous iniquity. Every one hereafter would spurn and despise an Imperial safe-conduct."¹

The sacrifice of Huss (and now that perfidious sacrifice was resolved) established perfect harmony ^{January.} between the Emperor and the whole reforming part of the Council. Notwithstanding all the remonstrances of the Pope and his partisans, it was immediately determined to receive the ambassadors of the Antipopes, if armed with full powers, and to admit them with full recognition of their dignity into the Council. Those of Benedict presented themselves first, but ^{Reception of Deputies from Antipopes.} not being provided with full powers, they were contemptuously rejected by the Emperor.² Their proposal, however, that Benedict XIII. and the King of Arragon should hold a conference with the Emperor at Nice, was not absolutely discarded. A few days after presented themselves the Archbishop of Ragusa and the other Legates of Gregory XII. They had been preceded by Louis Count Palatine, the delegates of the Archbishop of Treves, and the Bishops of Worms, Spire, and Verden, who still adhered to his obedience. The ambassadors, under this powerful support, were received with courteous honor; they declared their master, Gregory XII., prepared at once to resign the Papacy on condition that Benedict and John did the same; that no one of the three should preside in the Council.³

The demand for the cession of John, which had been at first a low and timid murmur, became the ^{John's cession demanded.} general clamor. Notwithstanding intrigues,

¹ Von der Hardt, iv. p. 83.

² "Do ward der König zornig, und sprach zu ihnen, den Boten des Peter Luna, nescio vos." — Justinger, Berner Chronik, 291, cited by Aschbach, p. 46.

³ Aschbach, p. 47.

bribes, promises, menaces, his partisans fell off daily.¹ Some appealed to his higher feelings; some uttered more or less disguised threats. The ambassador of Poland, Andrew Lascaris, Archbishop elect of Posen, urged his free abdication as a generous sacrifice for the peace of the Church. The Cardinal of St. Mark, in a writing communicated to the Council, the Emperor, and the Pope, urged upon John XXIII., that the stronger his grounds to be recognized as lawful Pope, the greater was his obligation to make this noble oblation for the good of the Church.² He more than hinted the power of the Council to enforce abdication.³ John's Italian Cardinals raised a loud cry, that it was almost, if not absolute, heresy to put the Pope on the same footing with those deposed at Pisa.⁴ The Cardinal d'Ailly at length summed up the whole in the fatal sentence, "The Universal Church, represented by a General Council, has full power to depose even a lawful Pontiff of blameless character, if it be necessary for the welfare of the Church."⁵

But these two Cardinals, Cambray and St. Mark, were preparing a measure still more disastrous to the Pope. The right of suffrage in an Œcumenic Council was by no means fixed and certain. In most of the later Councils the aristocratic principle had prevailed. No one below the Bishop or the Abbot had presumed to the right of voting on such high and mysterious matters. The Council of Pisa had admitted the right of professors and doctors of theology. The Pope, who knew his own strength, in the first session of the Council of Constance had rejected this claim. The

¹ Von der Hardt, ii. 478, 479.

² Von der Hardt, ii. 178, *et seq.*

³ Ibid. ii. 209.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 213.

⁵ L'Enfant, i. p. 103.

Cardinal d'Ailly, in a memorial to the Council, not only asserted the right of these learned men to free suffrage, but demanded it for princes and ambassadors in all matters not directly concerning the faith. The Cardinal of St. Mark went still further; he asserted the right of the lower clergy. "Was the Council not to profit by the profound learning of doctors in civil or canon law, and the wisest of the clergy?" "An ignorant prince or prelate," he said in coarse phrase, "is but a crowned ass. Is one intrusted with the cure of souls in a large parish less able to judge than the abbot who rules a few monks?"

The first proposition wrested the superiority in the Council from the hands of the Pope. The Italian Bishops were numerous and poor. Fear, interest, nationality, contempt of Transalpine barbarians, bound them to the service of the Pope. But this was not the worst or most menacing proposal. Already, according to the usage of most Universities, the Congregations, which prepared the business for the general Sessions of the Council, had met in Nations. The prelates, doctors, and ambassadors of the four great powers assembled each in a separate chamber, with a President changing every month, a secretary, notaries, and other officers. The Nations were: I. The Italians; II. The Germans, comprehending the Poles, Hungarians, Danes, and Scandinavians; III. The French; IV. The English. At a later period the Spaniards, who had not yet joined the Council, formed a fifth Nation. It was proposed to vote by Nations; and this decree, which reduced the Italians to a single suffrage, not- Feb. 7. withstanding the Pope's remonstrance, passed with irresistible acclamation.

Pope John was in the toils ; his most obstinate struggles only drew around him more closely the galling meshes. The subtle Italians found themselves circumvented by the steady aggression of the Tramontanes. Now came a more tremendous blow. A memoir was secretly presented to the Council, it was presumed by an Italian, with a full and darkly-colored statement of the detestable wickedness, the vices and crimes of the Pope's whole life.¹ The more noble-minded of the Germans and the Poles recoiled from the scandalous exposure. They refused the public inquisition into these articles, as degrading to the Roman See, as throwing a fatal slur on all the Prelates and dignitaries promoted by the Pope. They generously insisted on its suppression. But these sinister tidings did not escape the Pope, who had his secret intelligence of the most trivial proceedings in the Council. He was struck with utter consternation.² He summoned the Cardinals : he denied much, but he admitted some of the charges. He heaped upon them gifts and promises : he proposed desperately to confront the Council ; to make ample confession and to stand on the great principle, that a Pope could not be deposed

Charges
against the
Pope.

¹ "Quidam, ut præsumitur, Italicus, multos articulos valde famosos, et omnia peccata mortalia, nec non impacta quodammodo abominabilia continentes, contra eundem Balthasarem, in eodem Concilio exhibuit in scriptis tamen secretè, quod super illis contra eundem Balthasarem fieret inquisitio, et provideretur instantèr per Concilium memoratum." — A Niem, p. 25.

² "Quibus etiam interim clanculo et proditorie ad notitiam dicti Balthasaris deductis, illico mente consternatus est, et cœpit valde tremere et timere ac etiam quosdam sibi secreto Cardinales, et de quibus fiduciam habuit donis ac promissis allicere et consulere quid esset in eâ parte pro ejus honoris conservatione factururus, asserens, quod quædam in ipsis articulis descripta, tanquam homo, peccando commisisset, et aliqua non." — Ibid.

but for heresy. The Cardinals coldly advised him not to be precipitate, but to take some days to mature his determination.

His adversaries pursued their advantage. While the Pope was quailing under this peril, deputies appeared before him to persuade him to the cession of the Papacy. To their surprise and joy, the Pope consented; he drew up himself a form which was submitted to the Nations. But every

The Pope
determines
to abdicate.
Feb. 18.

word of the Papal form was scrutinized with the most suspicious jealousy. It was thought vague and ambiguous; doubtful pretensions, doubtful meanings lurked under its artful phrases. There was a long discussion. The Pope presented a second form; it was rejected. A third, proposed by the Emperor, was repudiated by the Pope. At that instant arrived the Delegates from the University of Paris, with the famous Gerson at their head. All did homage to the high au-

Feb. 18.

thority of this learned body, and their world-renowned Chancellor. A new form was prepared, it was supposed under the direction of Gerson, and presented by the Emperor with more peremptory demand of acceptance. The Pope stifled his grief, tried every subterfuge, raised every subtle objection; but the three nations, the Germans, the French, and the English, held resolutely together; the Italians supported him with but feeble fidelity. The one alteration admitted only made the words more stringent, severe, not to be eluded. In his despair he assumed a kind of sullen magnanimity. A general Congregation was summoned: the Emperor and the Deputies of all the Nations were present. The form was offered to the Pope by the Patriarch of Antioch. He read it to

March 1.

himself, and seemed to ponder over it. None of the bitterness of his heart betrayed itself in his countenance. With a calm clear voice he read publicly the irrevocable words: "I, Pope John XXIII., for the

Pope's
cession. repose of the whole Christian people, profess, engage, promise, swear, and vow to God, the Church, and this holy Council, willingly and freely to give peace to the Church, by the way of my simple cession of the Papacy; to do and to fulfil this effectually, according to the determination of this present Council, when and so soon as Peter di Luna and Angelo Corario, called in their respective obediences Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., shall in like manner cede the Papacy, to which they pretend, by themselves or by their lawful Proctors: and even in any case of vacancy by decease or otherwise, in which by my cession unity can be restored to the Church of God through the extirpation of the present Schism."

Ere he closed, the whole Assembly broke out into a paroxysm of rapture. The Emperor, the Cardinals, the Deputies of the Nations and of the University of Paris crowded round the throne, all rendering thanks. Te Deum was sung; the chant was interrupted by tears of joy; more wept than sung.¹

The next day was the second public Session. The March 2. Pope himself celebrated Mass. At its close he took his seat before the altar, with his face to the Council, and read the same form handed to him by the Patriarch of Antioch. At the words, "I swear and vow," he knelt before the altar, clasped his hands together, and uttered the words "Thus I promise," with profound solemnity. He returned to his chair, and

¹ Von der Hardt and L'Enfant throughout.

concluded the service. The Emperor advanced, took off his crown, threw himself at the feet of the Pope, and kissed them, expressing his fervent gratitude. So did the Patriarch of Antioch in the name of the Council.

Two days had hardly passed, when dark mutual suspicions began to transpire. Each party had ulterior views. Pope John had manifestly the hope that by his frank and full confession he might propitiate the Council ; perhaps be able to throw on his competitors the odium of refusing these equal terms ; or he might delude himself with fonder expectations. The Council felt that he was at their mercy, and were disposed to clench rather than relax their iron grasp. They had determined to press the conditional into an absolute abdication. This dire reality broke gradually but rapidly upon the Pope. First they demanded a Bull, declaring his abdication according to the customary form. The Pope treated this proposition as an insult, and haughtily repelled the Prelates from his presence : they dared not venture again on this perilous subject. But to the Emperor he was less intractable. Sigismund extorted from him a Bull, still, indeed, guarded in its language. John renewed his sacred promise ; but his March 5.

abdication yet depended on the simultaneous abdication of his rivals. The next demand was more insidious, more imperious, more embarrassing. Of the two rival Popes, most respect was paid to Benedict XIII. He had still a King, the King of Arragon, for his partisan. It had been proposed that the Emperor and the King of Arragon, accompanied by Benedict, should meet at Nice. John was required to invest ambassadors with full powers to execute his abdication at the same instant

with that of Benedict. Of these ambassadors the Emperor was to be one. With such irrevocable powers Pope John would have delivered himself bound hand and foot into the hands of Sigismund.

This proposal was made in a full Congregation by March 9. the Germans, French, and English, it was indignantly rejected by the Pope supported by the Italian Prelates. The Italians threatened to leave the Council if such rigorous demands were urged further.

Yet there was still the most bland and respectful outward amity. The next day the Pope presented to the Emperor the Golden Rose. That mysterious gift, according to Pope Innocent III.,¹ represented by its gold, its odor and its balm, the Godhead, the Body and Soul of the Redeemer. It was only bestowed by Popes on Sovereigns the most loyal servants of the Church. The Emperor received it with words of the most devout gratefulness. They dined together. The Emperor offered the consecrated Rose in the Church of the Virgin Mary.

The very next day, whether there was a deep latent March 10. hypocrisy under this seeming amity; whether the Emperor had discovered treachery in the Pope, and that he already meditated flight; or that he thought it no longer worth while to dissemble his uncompromising hostility, the proposal was openly made Proposal for a new Pope. to elect a new Pope. This proposition in itself proclaimed John XXIII. no longer Pope; it assumed the power in the Council of deposing him, and of proceeding to another choice. Among the vague, fond hopes of John had been that he himself

¹ Innocent III., *Prædicatio*, see Hurter. Compare also Durand, *Rationale*, vi. 121.

might be reëlected to the Pontificate. Such had been the design of his more steadfast partisans. The war-like Archbishop of Mentz declared that he would never render allegiance but to John. Words ran high ; the suppressed charges against the abominable life of the Pope were revived in their unmitigated blackness. Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, at the head of the English, had already espoused the Emperor's cause, and had urged unswervingly the searching reformation of all orders in the Church. The honest islander broke out in righteous indignation, that the Pope deserved to be burned at the stake.

All confidence was now at an end. It was notorious that Pope John meditated escape : and should he escape would boldly appeal to Christendom against the decrees of a headless Council. The Council was determined that he should not leave the city. An attempt was made by the Cardinal St. Angelo to pass the gates ; he was rudely arrested by the burgher guard. The Pope loudly complained of the violation of the Imperial safe-conduct, that safe-conduct which in the case of John Huss he had trampled under foot. The Magistrates of Constance threw the blame on the orders of the Emperor. Frederick of Austria alone declared that he at least would respect the person and liberty of the Pope.¹

Another Congregation of the Nations was held ; the Italians stood aloof. It was resolved to urge March 15. the Pope at once to appoint plenipotentiaries to execute his abdication, and that the Emperor should be one of these plenipotentiaries. They further required the Pope to give security that he would neither leave the Council, nor adjourn it to any other place. The Em-

¹ Cerretanus, apud Von der Hardt, iv. 55.

peror excused the rigid watch, now avowedly maintained at the gates of the city, by declaring that it was on account of the notorious design of many Cardinals clandestinely to leave Constance. It was his duty to prevent this unauthorized dissolution of the Council.

The Pope yielded to this last demand, the promise not to dissolve or adjourn the Council till the end of the Schism, and to do everything he could to promote the restoration of unity. This was a promise which, were it in his power, he could without difficulty violate or elude. But the immediate fatal step of authorizing others to execute his abdication, he refused with stubborn obstinacy. "He had no proof that Angelo Corario had resigned; he had only heard that Peter di Luna would resign."

The gloom which was gathering round John was broken by a faint but transient gleam of hope. The French Cardinals began to relent, to murmur at his harsh usage. The Italians seized the opportunity, and endeavored to detach them from the hostile league. They began to revive the question of voting by voices, not by Nations. The Germans and the English adhered to each other in resolute hostility to the Pope. In the French, the hatred and jealousy of the English, fostered by their long, cruel, and humiliating wars, struggled with their zeal for the unity and for the reform of the Church. The Cardinals, as Italian Prelates, sat with the Italian nation. The Five, the Cardinal of Cambray at their head, were deputed to persuade the French nation to milder measures. The Germans and English held only the more closely together, and were more inflexibly re-

Quarrel
in the
Council

solved by this opposition. The Bishop of Salisbury boldly proposed that if the Pope refused to appoint his Procurators, he should be put under arrest. The Emperor and his supporters of the other two Nations presented themselves in the French Congregation, and laid before them the result of their deliberations. The French insisted that they should withdraw. Sigismund broke out in a wrathful menace: "Now will be shown who are for the unity of the Church and for March 19. the Empire." The Cardinal of Cambray indignantly retired: the other four Cardinals protested against the violation of the liberty of debate. The Emperor answered that the word had escaped him in passion, that the French had perfect liberty, but the Cardinals were Italians, not French; if they withdrew not to their own chamber, he threatened them with imprisonment.

The quarrel, the Pope's last desperate hope, was appeased by the skilful influence of the ambassadors of France, especially by Duke Louis of Bavaria.

Late the following evening, after vespers, Sigismund visited the Pope; he found him reclining on his bed, somewhat indisposed. John complained of the oppressive air of Constance, he required change.¹ The Emperor earnestly dissuaded him from leaving Constance before the close of the Council, above all not clandestinely. "This would be to his eternal dishonor." He declared himself prepared to maintain his safe-conduct inviolable, but he had not power to permit him to depart from the city. The Pope answered in ambiguous phrase, that he would not

Interview of
the Emperor
and the Pope.
March 19.

¹ Theodoric à Niem here breaks out into praise of the salubrity of Constance.

quit Constance till the dissolution of the Council.¹ Many other rumors spread abroad of what took place at this memorable interview. The Emperor had demanded, or the Pope had offered, large sums for his liberty, under pretence of the great expense of maintaining the Council. The Pope, by one account, refused to buy the Emperor or to sell the Council. The Bishop of Salisbury, said to have been present, asserted to the face of the Pope the superiority of the Council over the Pope. The Pope kept no reserve. As soon as the Emperor had departed, to his attendants he taunted Sigismund as a drunkard, a fool, a madman, and a beggar.²

All this time the plot for his escape had been laid and fully matured. Frederick, Duke of Austria, had been a month in Constance, a month of humiliation and aggravation of his hatred towards the Emperor. He had been compelled to do homage for all his fiefs. He had attempted to delude the Emperor into favoring a breach of the peace which he had sworn to the Swiss Cantons. The Emperor, more crafty than himself, had betrayed him to the Swiss. Delegates from the cantons and cities had exposed the Duke's perfidy before the Emperor. That Frederick of Austria was in secret communication with the Pope, all suspected. The Emperor admonished the Duke concerning the peril of these intrigues. Frederick solemnly protested his innocence.

The afternoon of the very day after the interview with the Pope, the Duke of Austria had proclaimed a splendid tournament without

March 20.
Flight of
the Pope.

¹ "Credens forte, quod eo recedente, abhinc illud dissolveretur omnino."
— A Niem, 27.

² A Niem, *ibid.*

the gates of the city. Himself was to joust with the young Count of Cilly, brother of the Empress. All Constance thronged forth to the spectacle; the streets were desert. Pope John, in the dress of a groom, with a gray cloak, and a kerchief wrapt close over his face, mounted a wretched ill-accountred horse, with a cross-bow on the pommel of his saddle. He passed the gates unperceived, unchallenged, and rode about two hours to Ermatingen, at the efflux of the Rhine from the Lake of Constance. A boat was ready, he glided down the rapid stream to Schaffhausen, the castle of which was a stronghold of the Duke of Austria. Tidings were whispered in the ear of the Duke in the very act of his tourney. He continued the contest a short time, then courteously ceded the prize to his adversary De Cilly; in the evening he rode with a few attendants to Schaffhausen.

The news of the Pope's flight spread like wildfire.¹ The streets of Constance were thronged with prelates, priests, and populace, some in dismay, some in undisguised joy. A few Italians and Austrians stole out of the gates, and took to flight. The rabble broke into the palace from which the Pope had fled, to assert their privilege of plunder. The goldsmiths, money-changers, traders shut their shops.² The Burgomaster called the inhabitants to arms; the imperial soldiery occupied the principal streets and squares. The adversaries of the Pope were appalled. Some declared the Council actually dissolved by the departure of the Pope. The

¹ Von der Hardt. Almost all the authorities are collected, and references made to the rest. — Vol. iv. pp. 59, 66.

² This can hardly be called a riot, or a breach of the boasted peace in Constance.

superstitious shuddered at the ban which no doubt the Pope would hurl at the devoted city and the contumacious Council. Five Cardinals in the confusion stole away to the Pope.

In the morning the Emperor rode through the streets with the Count Palatine, Louis of Bavaria, and a long retinue of princes and nobles. He allayed the tumult among the people by the assurance of his protection to their liberties and properties. He summoned the Princes, Cardinals, Prelates, Ambassadors; he declared his resolute determination, with all his power, and at the hazard of his life, to maintain the authority of the assembly. He exhorted them not to disquiet themselves on account of the Pope's flight. The fathers of the Council resolved to send ambassadors to summon the Pope to return, and to commission plenipotentiaries for his absolute cession. These ambassadors were the Cardinals Orsini, St. Mark, Saluces, with the Archbishop of Rheims.

Pope John, almost immediately on his arrival at Schaffhausen, had written letters to the Council. "By the grace of God Almighty I have arrived at Schaffhausen, where I enjoy liberty and breathe air suited to the state of my health. I have come hither without the knowledge of my son, the Duke of Austria,¹ not to dispense myself from the promise of abdicating the Papacy in favor of the Church of God, but to execute it with greater freedom, as well as for the recovery of my health."

The letter of the Pope was treated as an audacious falsehood. On the walls of the palace at Constance was affixed a terrible writing, proclaiming the Pope

The Pope's
Letter.

¹ "Inscio filio meo Duce Austriæ." — Schaffhausen, March 21.

Antichrist, denouncing his base and perfidious arts and cajoleries, and those of the Cardinals, in order to dissolve the Council, recounting all his crimes, tyrannies, murders, simonies, sordid merchandise of the Church; calling on the Council to proceed against him, and to depose him at once from his throne. The Emperor in a full assembly arraigned the Duke of Austria as a perfidious traitor to the Church, the Council, and the Empire. Not a voice was raised in his defence.

The Council was now to proclaim itself the supreme, indefeasible, independent authority of Christendom. In the assertion of these new principles, which changed the Church from an autocracy to an aristocracy, the lead was taken by the French Nation, by the Chancellor Gerson, the voice of that Nation; but with the full concurrence of the Germans, the English, even of the Italians except the Cardinals. The Cardinals, as the Privy Council of the Pope, refused to be present, and to sanction doctrines limitary if not subversive of the Papal power.

Gerson laid down twelve great revolutionary maxims. Among them that Jesus Christ himself was the one primal and perfect Head of the Church, the Pope so only in a secondary sense; the union of Christ as the Spouse with his Church was alone indissoluble, that of the Pope might be dissolved; a Pope is necessary to complete the Church, but any particular Pope may be removed; the Church, or an Œcumenic Council representing the Church, is under the direction of the Holy Ghost, it may enact canons which the Pope is bound to obey, and cannot annul; a Council can be assembled in some cases without the authority even of a legitimate Pope; the Council can

The Council
supreme.

Gerson's
maxims.

command the cession of a Pope for the welfare of the Church, or the termination of a schism; the reformation of the Church both in faith and discipline rests ultimately with the Council; Councils ought to be held from time to time, as the one supreme, irrefragable representative of the Church.¹

The Pope was not idle at Schaffhausen; he summoned all his officers and the whole Papal Court to attend upon him.² He published an appeal addressed to the French; he hoped to touch their pride and their jealousy of the Germans and English. Among his first and bitterest charges was their refusal to proceed at once to the extirpation of heresy in the person of John Huss. He complained of the division of the Council into four Nations, by which the French and Italians — by far the most numerous and learned — were reduced to the level of the English and the Germans; of the extension of the suffrage, which had ever been confined to Cardinals, Prelates, and the

¹ Gerson had already promulgated these doctrines in a more contemptuous and offensive form. He had raised the Imperial power high above the Papal. "If an hereditary monarch may be deposed, how much more an elective! If an Emperor descended from a long unbroken royal lineage, how much more the son of a Venetian fisherman, whose father and grandfather had not beans enough to fill their stomachs! The Pope ought to be more easily deposed than another prelate. If the Pope sins, all partake of his sin; not so if a bishop. The canons on which rests the Papal authority were framed by fraud and craft." Gerson throws disdainfully aside the 6th book of Decretals and the Clementines. "What is a Pope? A man! the son of a man! clay of clay! a sinner, liable to sin! Two days before the son of a poor peasant, he is raised to be Pope. Is he then above repentance, confession, contrition? a sinless angel? a saint?" Wycliffe himself gives not a more awful catalogue of Papal crimes than this doughty churchman. "He is not above the Gospel." — Apud Von der Hardt, i. p. 76, *et seq.*; *et Oper.* vol. ii. p. 162, *et seq.* Tractatus pertinentes ad Concilium Constantianense.

² Von der Hardt, ii. 153.

Hierarchy ; of its usurpation by laymen as by priests, married and unmarried, ignorant and erudite. This turbulent rabble had hissed down grave Cardinals. His undoubted presidency of the Council had been usurped by the Emperor. He complained of the tyranny and force exercised by the Emperor ; the insults to his person — jousts had been celebrated under his windows, with intolerable clang of trumpets. He complained of the insolence of the English, who had threatened him with arrest, especially Robert Hallam of Salisbury. The most extraordinary paragraph was that in which he gave himself the lie, and now asserted that his flight was with the aid of the Duke of Austria.¹ He wrote to the King of France and the Duke of Orleans in the same strain ; it was his hope to enlist them in his cause against the Emperor, whom he represented as exercising a cruel tyranny over the Council.

The Pope at Schaffhausen was almost as much at the mercy of his enemies as at Constance. Could he have crossed the Alps, followed as he would have been by some of the Cardinals, and appealed to the loyalty and anti-Ghibellinism of some of the Guelfic cities, he might possibly have maintained the contest. But he had neither strength nor courage. A Gregory VII. or a Gregory IX. would instantly have issued his ban against the perfidious Emperor, who had violated his own safe-conduct, and the contumacious Council. He would have declared the assumption of supreme power by the Council an impious affront to St. Peter, a denial of Christ in his Vicar : he would have laid half Christendom under an Interdict, and placed before the hierarchy the alternative of forfeiting or endangering their

¹ Apud Von der Hardt, ii. 257.

own authority, or asserting that of the Pope. But
 John's
 conduct. John XXIII. wanted faith in himself and in
 his office. The truth, no doubt, of some of
 the damning charges against his life weighed heavily
 on his spirit, and no one could discern with more sagac-
 ity how much in the course of things, and through the
 long Schism, the old awe had fallen away from the
 name of the Pope. He was embarrassed, too, by
 the services of his now avowed ally, the Duke of Aus-
 tria. The Emperor eagerly seized the opportunity of
 crushing his refractory and hated vassal. The Pope
 could not abandon Frederick to his wrath, his only
 refuge was an Austrian castle. His other great par-
 tisan, the Archbishop of Mentz, had not dared to own
 his complicity in the flight; he had retired to his own
 city, and Mentz was too far from Italy, too deep in
 Germany to offer an asylum. The whole conduct,
 therefore, of John was that of timidity, vacillation, ter-
 giversation. His object was to detach the Cardinals
 from the Council, to gather them round himself, and to
 obtain for the Pope and the Sacred College that respect
 which the Pope alone had irrecoverably lost. The
 Archbishop of Rheims returned before the other am-
 bassadors of the Council, with a proposition to appoint
 the Cardinals collectively, with four Bishops, one of
 each Nation, Bath, Lebus (in Poland), Narbonne (the
 Italian was not named), the Procurators for his absolute
 cession.

The proceedings of the Council, on the other hand,
 Proceedings
 of the
 Council. were resolute, aggressive, imperious. Con-
 gregation after Congregation, and two Ses-
 sions of the whole Council, were held between the
 Pope's flight and the end of the month. At every

meeting there was the same scornful rejection of all the Pope's advances, the same inflexible determination to vindicate their own superior authority. The Cardinals were divided, perplexed ; they could not support, they would not abandon the Pope ; with his integral authority fell theirs ; they could not acknowledge, *March 26.* they dared not defy the Council. Hence at the First General Session after the flight two only were present, one French, the Cardinal of Cambray, one Venetian, St. Mark.

Yet the Council without the Cardinals appeared wanting in dignity. After much stormy discussion in the Congregations, the memorable Fourth Session of the Council was summoned for the 31st March. The President (the Cardinal of Naples, an Orsini) took his seat : on one side was Sigismund the Emperor, and the hierarchy in their ranks ; on the other the great laymen, Ambassadors, Princes, Dukes, and Counts. The resolutions, the final fatal resolutions, agreed upon the day before, or averred by one party to have been agreed upon at a full Congregation of the Nations, were placed in the hands of Zabarella, the Cardinal of Florence. He read in calm tone the Preface and the Decree : — “ The said Council of Constance, lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Ghost, an Œcumenic Council, which represents the Catholic Church Militant, has received immediately from Jesus Christ power which every one of every estate and dignity, even Papal, is obliged to obey in all which regards the faith and the extirpation of the present Schism.” Here the voice of the Cardinal faltered at the unexpected or unwelcome words. He either refused to read on or read imperfectly, with faint and trembling accents, “ and the

reformation of the Church in its head and in its members." In the tumult which rose the two other resolutions were hardly heard. These declared that the Pope should not adjourn the Council from Constance to any other place, nor summon his Court to attend him elsewhere ; that all promotions made by him from that time were null and void.

The Council would not permit the Cardinals to elude April 10. their stern determination. At a Fifth General Session, notwithstanding much altercation and strife with the Cardinals, the three Decrees were read fully, distinctly, dictatorially, by the Archbishop of Posen.¹ The Pope had not awaited this act: he had dropped down the Rhine to another strong fortress, Further flight of the Pope. Laufenberg. But his Cardinals and most of his Court refused to follow him ; they returned in shame and contempt to Constance.

The rapid, total, and unpitied humiliation of the Duke of Austria left the Pope a miserable Humiliation of the Duke of Austria. defenceless fugitive. On April 7th the ban of the Empire, the excommunication of the Council, were promulgated against this capital traitor. All his vassals were released from their sworn fealty ; all treaties, contracts, oaths, vows, concerning the man excommunicated alike by the Church and by the Empire, were declared null and void. Whoever could conquer might possess the territory, the towns, the castles of the outlaw. The Swabian Princes fell on his possessions in Alsace ; the Swiss Cantons (they only with some reluctance to violate solemn treaties) seized his hereditary dominions, even Hapsburg itself. The Duke of Upper Bavaria, the Bishops of Augsburg, and Coire, the Pa-

¹ Von der Hardt, iv. 105.

triarch of Aquileia, the Archbishop of Salzburg, Albert of Austria, the Count of Cilly, overran the Tyrol. Before the month had expired, this powerful April 30.

Duke was hardly permitted to humble himself in person before the Emperor, whose insatiate revenge spared nothing that could abase his ancient foe. It was a suppliant entreating pardon in the most abject terms, a Sovereign granting it with the most hard and haughty condescension. Frederick surrendered all his land and possessions to be held at the will of the Emperor, until he should deign to reinvest the Duke with them under the most degrading tenure of allegiance and fealty.

The Pope in the mean time had fled again in mean disguise to Fribourg in the Brisgau, a pleasant The Pope at Fribourg. city, which still owned the dominion of the

Duke of Austria. He had sent certain articles to the Council from Laufenberg; he sent others more ambiguous and unsatisfactory from Fribourg. The Council, while the Pope was thus sinking into despicable insignificance, was still rising in pretensions and power. An address to all Christendom vindicated their proceedings towards the Pope. "The King of the Romans (the Emperor), only at their request, had closed the gates to prevent some faithless Prelates from leaving the Council." "The Pope had deserted the Council after having deliberately sworn to maintain it. He had summoned his Cardinals and his Court to follow him in his ignominious flight, in order to dissolve the Council." As yet, however, there was no acrimonious persecution of the Pope. A mandate was issued by the Council prohibiting scurrilous and abusive libels against the Pontiff and the Court of Rome. A motion to re-

fuse the Cardinals admission and the right of suffrage was rejected.

The Pope had one wild hope: he had looked to France, to the King; he now looked to the Duke of Burgundy. Under his protection he meditated an escape to Avignon; to be nearer the Rhine he removed to Brisach; but the Duke of Burgundy had his reasons for declining to offend the Council. His own cause, Jean Petit's defence of his assassination of the Duke

April 17. of Orleans, rested on their decision. Even Frederick of Austria was compelled to the hard terms of surrendering the Pope to the Council. At the Sixth

April 19. Session instructions were given to deputies from the Council to compel the surrender of the Pope.

April 23. They found him not at Fribourg; they followed him to Brisach. He promised an answer the next day; the next day he had disappeared.

The ensuing Session determined to cite the Pope, and proceed to the utmost extremity. The citation was fixed on the gates of the city, on the doors of all the churches. It summoned Pope John XXIII. to answer for the maintenance of the Schism, for heresy, simony, maladministration and notorious dilapidation of the estates and possessions of the Papacy; for the scandals and notorious criminalities of his life and conversation. A body of three hundred armed men, under Frederick of Nuremberg, were sent to seize the

May 13. fugitive. In vain the Pope sent full powers to the Cardinals of Cambray, St. Mark, and Florence, to act in his behalf: the Cardinals refused to undertake

May 14. the trust. The next day, the time assigned to the Pope for his appearance having expired, the Council proceeded in its course. Seventy articles were

exhibited: never probably were seventy more awful accusations brought against man than against the Vicar of Christ. The Cardinal St. Mark made a feeble attempt to repel the charge of heresy; against the darker charges no one spoke a word. Before the final decree, sixteen of those of the most indescribable depravity were dropped, out of respect not to the Pope, ^{Eleventh Session.} but to public decency and the dignity of the ^{May 25.} office. On the remaining undefended fifty-four the Council gravely, deliberately, pronounced the sentence of deposition against the Pope.¹

Weary, deserted by all, conscience-stricken, betrayed perforce by the Duke of Austria, pursued by ^{Surrender and imprison-} the Imperial soldiers, John in his fall was ^{ment of} without courage as without dignity. He had ^{the Pope.} ^{May 27.} already been brought to Rodolfzell, and imprisoned in the castle under an Hungarian guard. On the first demand he yielded up the insignia of universal spiritual power, the Papal Seal, the Fisherman's Ring, the Book of Petitions.² His sentence was read to him by two Cardinals. He acknowledged its justice, protested that he surrendered of his free-will the Papal dignity, and would never attempt to resume it. This one vow John XXIII. religiously observed: he had neither opportunity nor temptation to break it. He was brought to the strong Castle of Gottleben, without the walls of

¹ Among the sentences was "suis detestabilibus inhonestisque vitâ et moribus ecclesiam Dei et populum Christianum scandalisantem, ante ejus assumptionem ad Papatum et post usque ad ista tempora." — Apud Von der Hardt. I give one class of charges in the words of Gobelinus: "Item ipse graviter fuit infamatus, quod cum uxore fratris sui concubuerit; cum sanctimonialibus incestum, cum virginibus stuprum, et cum conjugatis adulterium perpetraverit, nec non alia flagitia, propter qualia ira Dei descendit in filios diffidentie." — P. 341. See the 6th article.

² Liber Supplicationum.

Constance. To his sentence of deposition had been subjoined a sentence of imprisonment, at least for safe custody. He was afterwards committed to the charge of the Elector Palatine. The Castle of Heidelberg was assigned as his residence and his prison.

There was another prisoner in Gotleben, a man John Huss. against whose life his worst enemies brought no word of reproach. John Huss had been for some months in irons pining in a dungeon of this fortress, under custody of the Bishop of Constance. To Huss the fall of the Pope, though it might seem to deliver him from his most implacable enemy, was fatal. His friends had fondly supposed that he would meet with more calm and equable justice, if not with favor, before a Council of which all the leading members had concurred in denouncing ecclesiastical abuses, the vices and ignorance of the clergy in terms as strong and uncompromising as the Reformers of Bohemia, as Wycliffe himself: a Council which had ventured on so bold an innovation, a heresy so manifest according to the principles long dominant in Christendom, as to set itself above the Pope, to assume the power of deposing a Pope. Now too would appear in his proper character an Emperor whose noble ambition seemed to be the restoration of the Church to purity as well as to unity, under whose safe-conduct he had come to Constance. Sigismund had reluctantly yielded to the violation of that safe-conduct, and might now redeem his pledge, which the Pope had almost compelled him to forfeit.

So entirely were the friends of Huss under this delusion that Jerome of Prague, the second in Jerome of Prague. influence and character among the Bohemian Reformers, had thought it a favorable opportunity to

join his friend. Jerome, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Huss, had set out from Prague to share the dangers and to support the cause of his brother teacher of the truth. He entered Constance secretly, without a safe-conduct. The Council issued a summons to him to appear within fourteen days. They offered full freedom of entrance into Constance; his departure must depend on their judgment in his cause. Jerome turned his face back towards Prague; but at Hirschau, in the Upper Palatinate, he rashly broke out, in the presence of many clergy, into denunciations against the Council. He was seized and sent prisoner to Constance.

Huss and his followers, in their infatuated expectations of leniency, or of respect for the freedom of such opinions as theirs, showed their ignorance of mankind, of the hierarchy, as well as of the bounds beyond which it was premature to attempt the emancipation of the religious mind of Europe. The leaders in the Council of Constance, the Cardinal d'Ailly, Gerson, still more the better Italian Cardinals, St. Mark and Zabarella of Florence, had no conception beyond a purely aristocratic and hierarchical reformation, which should restore its strength to the ecclesiastical system by raising the morals of the corrupt clergy and the ignorant monks and friars. But they would have shuddered with horror and indignation at the examination of any established doctrine, or even of any ancient ritual observance. They had not only the pride of ecclesiastical rank, but the pride of that learning which consisted in a laborious and masterly command of the vast and voluminous theology, and of the Canon Law, the established code of Christendom. They were conscientiously convinced that there was no knowledge, at least of religious

things, beyond this circle. The most far-sighted might not perceive the full bearings, but they had an instinctive sagacity which shrunk from the democratic doctrines which had been preached by Wycliffe, and were partially, at the least, embraced by the Bohemian Reformers: their mistrust was more likely to exaggerate than diminish the danger. These doctrines without doubt called in question, and submitted to bold inquiry, some which were thought the fundamental articles of the dominant creed, withdrew in fact the ritual and the instruction of the Church from the sacred Latin, and vulgarized it into the national language. They already spoke of an authority to which all the theology of the Church, which had been accumulating for centuries, and all the law of the Church (their proud possession), must submit, that of the Bible — the Bible translated and popularized for general use. Above all, they owned the great vital principle of Wycliffism, that the wicked or unworthy priest was no priest. Be he Pope, Cardinal, Bishop, Curate, or Friar, his vices absolutely annulled all his privileges, his immunities, his rights to his estates, his claim to tithes or church-dues. The efficacy of the Sacraments which he administered perplexed or divided the teachers of this bewildering doctrine.

It was in truth, in its broad enunciation, a specious and noble theory; but to the calmest, still more to the interested, the objections raised against Wycliffe could not but occur in appalling force. Without an infallible tribunal, without an omniscient Judge to pronounce sentence against the whole hierarchy or any individual priest, how impracticable, how iniquitous! Was this sentence to be intrusted for its award and execution to

Kings coveting the wealth of the Church ; to an ignorant populace, who knew not the difference between unchristian arrogance or the calm and holy severity of good Churchmen ; or even to the honest but fanatic teachers of purer doctrines, usually as intolerant as those against whose intolerance they have risen up ? In such a strife must fall law, order, property, government, the salutary restraints of religion.

John Huss and Jerome of Prague, as among the first distinguished martyrs for Christian liberty, and as condemned by a Council in the face of Christendom, have obtained perhaps importance, not fully recognized in their own day, assuredly not till after the Bohemian war. It could not be supposed that a great hierarchical Senate from the four most powerful kingdoms, indeed from all Europe, with the Emperor, Views of the Council. who took a pride in exalting its authority, at its head, a Council which had deposed Popes, would be bearded and defied by two or three contumacious priests from a remote, obscure, and half-barbarous land. The burning of heretics was now so completely part of the established usage of the Church, as to cause, if compassion, none of that revulsion of feeling which has happily grown into our Christianity. And it is but justice to the "Fathers of Constance," as they are called, to admit that they tried all milder means of persuasion. Even the bitterest opponents of Huss, Michael de Causis and Stephen Palecz, earnestly besought him to make disavowal of his errors. The course of the Churchman seemed to him clear and determinate, and unavoidable. In the Emperor his pride and his honor, and even his interest, came into perilous collision The Emperor. with these opponents. Was he to recede before a sim-

ple Bohemian? — and Sigismund had an old hereditary grudge, as well as a German aversion, to Bohemia. He was beset on all sides. The Churchmen pressed him with the argument that he had gone beyond his powers in granting security to a heretic over whom the Church alone has jurisdiction. “He that is false to God, has no right to appeal to truth or faith.”¹ The King of Arragon addressed a letter to Sigismund, taunting him with his manifest favor to a notorious heretic, and avowing astonishment that he had not long before done justice upon Huss. Yet, on the other hand, there still was his safe-conduct, full, distinct, not to be disavowed. He looked too, hereafter, to the succession to the throne of Bohemia. That kingdom had already sent another petition, almost imperious, expressing the sentiments of the magnates of the realm, and demanding the release of John Huss.

The affair of Huss had been revived almost simultaneously with that of the deposition of Pope John. The Council seemed resolved, while it proceeded to extremities in one direction, to show to Christendom that it had no disposition to dangerous latitude on the other. Early in May, in a numerous Session of the Council (the Eighth), came forth a full condemnation of Wycliffe and his doctrines. During the imprisonment of Huss the controversy concerning the administration of the Cup to the laity had been renewed in Prague. The Curate of St. Michael in that city, James von Mies, commonly called Jacobel, had embarked in violent warfare with the opponents of this innovation. The Bishop of Lieutomyssel had

¹ See Andrew Ratisbon *Chronic. Eccard*, i. p. 2146; and *Pez, Thes. Anecd. Novissim.* ii. 3, 626.

denounced the proceedings of Jacobel at Constance ; and this denunciation could not but exasperate the general animosity against Huss.

On the last day of May the Bohemians presented a memorial to the Council. They expostulated ^{Bohemian} on the neglect of their former petition : they ^{memorial.} recited the declaration of faith which had been disseminated throughout Bohemia by the friends of Huss, asserting his full belief in all the articles of the Creed, his determination to defend them to death, and the testimonial of the Grand Inquisitor, the Bishop of Nazareth, acquitting him of all heterodox opinions. They demanded his release from his noisome prison, by which his health was affected, and that he should be heard before the Council against his calumnious enemies. The Patriarch of Antioch answered coldly in the name of the Council, that the testimonials were of no avail, till they should have undergone close examination before themselves ; they had no faith in his statements. Yet they would condescend, as an act of grace, to grant him a public hearing ; for this end he would be removed from his present confinement. Sigismund so expressed his approbation of that resolution to grant a hearing, that the partisans of Huss weakly concluded that the royal favor would protect their teacher.

The Council would willingly have avoided the notoriety of a public examination. Huss was ^{June 1.} visited in his cell at Gotleben by the Patriarch of Antioch, by Michael de Causis, and Stephen Palecz. He was urged to retract. They now, however, interrogated him, as he complains, with the captious and ensnaring severity of Inquisitors, adducing against him

words culled out of all his letters and discourses; Palecz adduced phrases uttered in frank and careless conversation.¹ The Patriarch reproached him with the wealth he had obtained: "Have you not seventy thousand florins?" His answers were brief and cautious: "I will retract when convinced of my error."

He was removed to the Franciscan cloister. In the mean time, the utmost industry had been employed in collecting obnoxious passages from all his writings, and from adverse witnesses. The Cardinals sat in Council on these in order to frame articles of accusation. Sigismund required that these articles should be communicated to Huss. The Cardinals deigned to accede, not as of right, but as of favor. The partisans of Huss were prepared, on the other hand, with authenticated copies of all his writings to confront false citations, or contest unjust inferences.

On the 5th of June John Huss was brought in Huss before the Council. chains into the Council. His works were presented to him; he acknowledged them for his own. The articles were read; but either the indignation of his adversaries, or the zeal of his partisans, or both, raised such an uproar, that silence could hardly be enforced. Huss calmly declared himself ready to maintain his opinions by Scripture and the Fathers. Another outburst of abuse and mockery compelled the Council to adjourn its proceedings.

On the morning of the 7th of June, Constance was Second appearance. darkened by an eclipse of the sun. At Prague the eclipse was total, a sinister omen to the followers of Huss. Two hours after the dark-

¹ Compare L'Enfant, i. p. 306, with references to the letters of Huss.

ness had passed away, John Huss stood again before the Council. All the more distinguished Fathers sat in their order. The Emperor was on his throne; a strong guard attended to keep order. Wenzel de Duba and John de Chlum, Nobles, and other Bohemians watched the course of things with grave solicitude. The accusers began on the perilous article of Transubstantiation. But the answer of Huss was clear, distinct, unimpeachable. The Cardinal of Cambray alone, as jealous for his nominalist philosophy as for his orthodox religion, endeavored by a syllogism about universals, intelligible only according to the scholastic jargon,¹ to prove that Huss must assert that the material bread remained after consecration. Huss extricated himself with address and triumph. "His philosophic doctrine was that of St. Anselm." He averred Transubstantiation to be a perpetual miracle, and so exempt from all logical form. An English Bishop took up the Cardinal's cause. "A boy in the schools," said Huss, "might answer such puerility." To the other more general charges, that he had preached Wycliffite doctrines; that he officiated as priest when under excommunication by the Pope; that he had spoken with contempt of some of the most learned Prelates of the day, even the Chancellor Gerson; that he had excited tumults in Bohemia; he replied with admirable presence of mind and perfect self-command. Once, indeed, he admitted that he had said, "Wycliffe, I trust, will be saved; but could I think he would be damned, I would my soul were with his." A burst of contemptuous laughter followed this avowal, of which, however, it is not difficult to see the hidden meaning.

¹ "Credisne universale a parte rei?"

After some hours of turbulent discussion, he was ordered to withdraw, under custody of the Archbishop of Riga, Keeper of the Seals to the Council.

Before he was removed, the Cardinal of Cambray rose and demanded, whether he had not boasted that, if he had not come to the Council of his own free-will, neither King nor Emperor could have compelled his appearance. "There are many nobles in Bohemia," answered Huss, "who honor me with their protection. Had I not willed to come to the Council, they would have placed me in some stronghold beyond the power of King or Emperor." The Cardinal lifted up his hands in amazement at this insolence; a fierce murmur ran through the assembly. Thereat arose John de Chlum: "John Huss speaks truth; I am one of the least of the nobles of Bohemia; in my castle I would have defended him for a year against all the forces of Emperor or King. How much more Lords mightier than I, with castles far more impregnable!" The Cardinal said in a lower tone, "Huss, I admonish you for your safety and your honor to submit to the Council, as you have promised in prison." All eyes were turned upon the Emperor. Sigismund rose; the purport of his speech was that he had issued the safe-conduct in order to give Huss an opportunity of rendering account of his faith before the Council. The Cardinals and Prelates (he thanked them for it) had granted him this favor; though many asserted that it was beyond his power to take a heretic under his protection. He counselled Huss to maintain nothing with obstinacy, but to submit to the Council on all articles charged and proved against him. So doing he might return in the good graces of the Council to his home, after some slight

penance and moderate satisfaction. "If not, the Council will know how to deal with you. For myself, far from defending you in your errors, and in your contumacy, I will be the first to light the fire with my own hands." Huss began to thank the Emperor for his clemency in granting him safe-conduct. The friendly interruption of John de Chlum reminded him that the Emperor had charged him with obstinacy. He protested in God's name that he had no such intention. "He had come of his own freewill to Constance, determined, if better instructed, to surrender his opinions." He was conducted back to prison.

The next day Huss stood the third time before the Council. Thirty-nine articles were exhibited June 8.
against him, twenty-six from his book on the Third appearance.

Church, seven from a controversial Tract against Stephen Palecz, six from one against Stanislaus of Znaym. Huss, like most Reformers, held the high Augustinian notion of Predestination. "None were members of the true indefeasible Church, but those predestined to eternal life." On these points he appealed triumphantly to the all-honored name of Augustine. None dared to answer. But when this theory was applied to Churchmen, to Prelates, to the Pope himself; and when their whole authority was set on their succession not to the titles, but to the virtues of the Apostles, the Council sat amazed and embarrassed. "The Pontiff, who lives not the life of Peter, is no Vicar of Christ, but the forerunner of Antichrist." A citation from St. Bernard seemed to confirm that dread sentence. "The slave of avarice is the successor not of Peter, but of Judas Iscariot." The Churchmen looked at each other and smiled, no doubt some a bitter smile. In an

evil moment Huss pressed his fearless logic. "A King in mortal sin is no King before God." Sigismund was looking out of a window: "There never," he was saying, "lived a more pernicious heretic." The Cardinal of Cambray roused his attention to this last perilous conclusion. Huss repeated his words aloud. The Emperor only answered, "There is no man that sinneth not." "What!" burst out the Cardinal, "art thou not content with degrading the ecclesiastical power, wouldst thou thrust Kings from their thrones?" "A man," argued Palecz, "may be a true Pope, Prelate, or King, though not a true Christian." "Why, then, have you deposed John XXIII.?" The Emperor answered, "For his notorious misdeeds." Huss had been guilty of the rashness of discomfiting and perplexing his adversaries. The Cardinals were most indignant at what Cambray denounced as an unjust and overdrawn appeal to popular animosity against them. They constantly urged that the articles gave but a mild and mitigated notion of the language of Huss. Huss was arraigned for this assertion: "No heretic should suffer more than ecclesiastical punishment, none be delivered to the secular arm to be punished by death." Yet even Huss, and Huss at that moment, shrank from the full avowal of that simple Evangelic maxim. "The heretic was first to be instructed fairly, mildly, humbly, out of the Scriptures and by reason; if he refused to desist from his errors, to be punished according to St. Augustine, in the body."¹ He acknowledged a sentence in his works, which likened those who gave up a heretic to the secular arm unconvicted, to the Pharisees. "Whom," cried the Cardinals, "meanest thou by the

¹ "Corporaliter puniri debere."

Pharisees?" "Those who deliver an innocent man to the civil sword."¹

At the close of the Session the Cardinal of Cambray urged Huss, who had heard the atrocious charges adduced against him, to make unqualified submission to the Council, and to abjure all his errors: "if he persisted, the Council would know how to proceed." The Emperor condescended to argue with him in the same tone. His two accusers, Palecz and De Causis, appealed to Heaven, that they were actuated by no personal hostility towards Huss.

Huss replied with firm humility, that he sought instruction; he could not abjure errors of which he was not convinced. Many things charged against him were forged, many perverted from their true meaning; he could not abjure those, he could not sin against his conscience. He was remanded to prison; the faithful Bohemian Knight, John de Chlum, followed to console his weary friend.

The Emperor rose: "You have heard the charges against Huss proved by trustworthy witnesses, some confessed by himself. In my judgment, each of these crimes is deserving of death. ^{Speech of the Emperor.} If he does not forswear all his errors, he must be burned. If he submits, he must be stripped of his preacher's office, and banished from Bohemia: there he would only disseminate more dangerous errors. . . . The evil must be extirpated root and branch. . . . If any of his partisans are in Constance, they must be proceeded against with the utmost severity, especially his disciple, Jerome of Prague." Sigismund had wrought himself, no doubt as an excuse to his remonstrant conscience, to a fanaticism of obedience to the Church.

¹ Von der Hardt, p. 319. The fullest report of the whole trial.

Huss heard in his prison the Emperor's declaration. "I was warned not to trust to his safe-conduct. I have been under a sad delusion ; he has condemned me even before mine enemies."

The fatal hour had now come. The Council which asserted itself to be under the actual inspiration of the Holy Ghost, could not recede without the impeachment of indifference to doctrines which itself had declared to be deadly heresy, or without disavowing the right established by the terrible usage of centuries, of awarding capital punishment for that which the Church had been so long teaching the world was a mortal crime ; a crime which it was the most sacred duty to God and man in the Priest to avenge, in the temporal Sovereign, at the demand of the Priest, to punish by fire. Huss could not retract without perjury to his own conscience ; without base treachery to his followers, whom he had instructed, whom he had kindled to a fanatic faith in that which himself had believed, which he still believed, to be the saving Gospel of Christ, and this from the fear of death, death which, as he himself was assured, as his partisans had no less confidence, would secure him the martyr's crown.

A form of recantation was drawn by Cardinal Zabarella, studiously mild in its terms, but of necessity an explicit renunciation of his errors, a humble submission to the determinations, to the definitions of the Holy Council. He was to abjure, retract, revoke all his errors, and undergo whatever penance the Council might decree for his soul's health.

The answer of Huss was a prayer to God Almighty for everlasting life, through Christ Jesus. He thanked the reverend Father, Zabarella of

Answer of
Huss.

Florence, for his pious and paternal kindness. "But if Eleazar under the Old Law refused to eat forbidden food, lest he should sin against God, and leave a bad example to posterity, how can I, a Priest of the New Law, however unworthy, from fear of a punishment so brief and transitory, sin so heinously against the law of God, first by departure from truth, secondly by perjury, thirdly by grievous scandal to my brethren? It is better for me to die, than by avoiding momentary punishment to fall into the hands of God, and perhaps into everlasting fire. I have appealed to Jesus Christ, the One All-powerful and All-just Judge; to Him I commit my cause, who will judge every man, not according to false witnesses and erring Councils, but according to truth and man's desert."¹

Persons of the highest rank, Cardinals, Prelates, the Emperor, even his adversary, Stephen Palecz, ^{Attempt to persuade him} again entreated him, and with tears, to depart ^{to yield.} from his stubborn resolution. His answer was calm, unboastful, with nothing of the vehemence or contemptuousness of fanaticism; he acknowledged how hardly his soul was tried; at the same time, in his letters to Bohemia, some of which were publicly read in the Bethlehem Chapel at Prague, and in others addressed to the University of Prague, he declared that he could forswear no one of his doctrines. He had not been convinced out of the Scriptures, he awaited in tranquillity the judgment of the Lord.

The Council proceeded in full Session to condemn the doctrine of Jacob de Mies concerning the July 1.

Cup: an omen and a warning. The writings of Huss were ordered to be publicly burned. The Council it-

¹ Von der Hardt, iv. 329.

self sent another deputation to urge submission. The Emperor had been a short time absent ; the day before the final judgment, he sent four Bishops, Wenzel of Duba, and John de Chlum, with a still mitigated form of recantation. Huss was only to retract those tenets which he acknowledged to be his own. Even John de Chlum endeavored to move, or rather to strengthen him. "I am but an unlettered man, unfit to counsel one so learned. If you are conscious of error, be not ashamed to confess it to the Council. If not, I cannot advise you to act against your conscience. Bear any punishment rather than renounce the truth." Huss answered, that he would abandon any opinion on proofs adduced from the Holy Scriptures. A Bishop reproached him with arrogantly setting up his opinion against the whole Council. "Let the lowest in the Council convince me, I will humbly own my error." The night before his condemnation Huss made confession, and, it is asserted, received absolution from a monk.

The Council met in the Cathedral; the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia presided. Sigismund and the Princes of the Empire were present. While Mass was celebrated, Huss, as a heretic, stood in the porch. The Bishop of Lodi preached from the text, "That the body of sin might be destroyed."¹ It was a fierce declamation: it suggested that Huss was as "bad as Arius, worse than Sabellius." The preacher closed with adulatory praise of the Emperor. "It is thy glorious office to destroy heresies and schism, especially this obstinate heretic." He pointed to Huss, who was kneeling in an elevated place and in fervent prayer.

¹ Rom. vi. 6. The sermon may be read in Von der Hardt, iii. 1.

A Decree of the Council was read, inhibiting all present, without exception, Prelates, Princes, Kings, Emperors, under pain of excommunication and two months' imprisonment, to speak without permission, to reply, to interrupt the proceedings, to give any sign or murmur of applause or disapprobation either with the hands or feet. Certain tenets of Wycliffe were here recited and condemned; afterwards thirty articles containing the doctrines of Huss.¹ Often, while these articles were read, Huss attempted to speak; as often he was put to silence. At length, while he was arraigned as believing that the material bread remained after the consecration, he broke out, "That I deny, so I have never believed or taught." He renounced with equal vehemence a charge that he had added a fourth person to the Trinity; he defied them to produce their nameless witness. His appeal to Christ was treated as an impious error, "Oh blessed Jesus!" he uttered with a loud voice, "This thy Council condemns us, because in our afflictions we have sought refuge with Thee, the One just Judge." He added, "This I constantly affirm, that the surest and most safe appeal is to the Lord Jesus; Him none can pervert or bribe by gifts, none deceive by false witnesses, or beguile by craft. He will render unto every one his own." He justified himself for having continued to officiate as Priest after his excommunication by the Pope. "Freely came I hither under the safe-conduct of the Emperor." He turned and looked steadily at Sigismund. A deep blush passed over the face of the Emperor.

The Bishop of Concordia, an aged, bald Italian Prelate, rose to read the two sentences, one con-

¹ Von der Hardt; more briefly in *L'Enfant*, p. 403.

demning the writings, the other the person of John Huss to the flames ; his writings, as propagating the tenets of the heresiarch Wycliffe, and as containing many things erroneous, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, some notoriously heretical ; all, both in Latin and Bohemian, were adjudged to be publicly and solemnly burned.

Huss was commanded to kneel and hear his own sentence. The Council, having God before its eyes, declared Huss a real and manifest heresiarch, who had advanced doctrines offensive, rash, seditious, had trampled under foot the power of the Keys and the censures of the Church, had scandalized all true Christians, by his appeal to Jesus Christ. " This John Huss, being thus obstinate and incorrigible, who has refused to enter into the bosom of the Church, and abjure his errors." Huss broke in, " I have ever desired, and still desire, to be instructed out of the Holy Scriptures." The Bishop concluded with condemning him to be degraded and despoiled of his Orders. Huss rose from his knees ; he uttered a fervent prayer to God to pardon his enemies. Some of the older Priests, even Bishops, looked sternly at him, and laughed his prayers to scorn. The Archbishop of Milan, the Bishops of Bangor, Feltre, Ast (in Hungary), Alexandria, and Lavaur were designated for the office of degradation. Huss was clad in all the attire of the Priesthood, and led with the cup in his hand to the high altar, as if about to celebrate Mass. As they put on the alb, he said, " They put a white robe on our Lord to mock him, when Herod sent him to Pilate." Once more the Bishops implored him to recant. He declined for the same reasons alleged before. " Behold," said the Bish-

ops, "how obstinate he is in his malice." The cup was taken from his hand: "Accursed Judas, thou hast deserted the way of peace, thou hast entered into counsel with the Jews. We take away this cup in which the blood of Christ is offered for the redemption of souls." Huss said, "I trust that I shall drink it this day in the kingdom of heaven." He was stripped one by one of his robes, on each a curse was pronounced. "These mockeries I bear with equal mind for the name and the truth of Christ." The tonsure was now to be effaced. They disputed whether it was to be done with scissors or with a razor. "Lo! they cannot agree," said Huss, "how to put me to shame." It was done with scissors; the hair cut in the form of a cross; a high paper crown, daubed over with devils, was set on his head. "We devote thy soul to the devils in hell." "And I commend my soul to the most merciful Lord, Christ Jesus." So the Church made over the heresiarch to the secular arm. The Emperor delivered him to Louis, Elector Palatine, the Imperial Vicar; the Elector to the Magistrates of Constance, the Magistrates to the executioners.

Huss was led away with two of the headsman's servants before him, two behind. Eight hundred horse followed, and the whole multitude from the city. Over a narrow bridge they went in single file, lest it should break with their weight. They stopped before the Bishop's palace, that Huss might gaze on the pile on which his books lay burning. He only smiled at this ineffectual act of vengeance. As he went along he addressed the people in German, protesting against the injustice of his sentence, "His adversaries had been able to convince him of no error." The place of exe-

cution was a meadow without the walls. He knelt, recited several psalms, with the perpetual burden, "Lord Jesus, have mercy upon me. Into thy hands I commend my spirit." "We know not," said the people, "what this man may have done, we only know that his prayers to God are excellent." They asked if he would have a confessor. A Priest on a stately horse, and richly attired, protested that no confessor should be granted to a heretic. But Reichenthal, as himself relates, called forth Ulric Schorand, a man of piety and wisdom. Ulric required that Huss should first retract the errors for which he was condemned. Huss declined to confess on such terms. "I have no need, I am guilty of no mortal sin." He endeavored to address the people again in German. The Elector Palatine refused permission. Then Huss prayed aloud, "Lord Jesus, for thy sake I endure with patience this cruel death. I beseech thee to pardon mine enemies." As he spoke, the paper mitre fell from his head. The rude soldiers replaced it: "He shall be burned with all his devils." He spoke gently to his guards. "I trust that I shall reign with Christ, since I die for his Gospel."

He was then tied fast by an old rusty chain to the stake affixed on a platform. The Elector Palatine and the Marshal Oppenheim advanced, and again urged him to recant. Huss replied, that he willingly signed his testimony with his blood. All he had taught and written was to save men's souls from Satan, and from the dominion of sin. The fire blazed up; it is said that an old woman was busy in heaping the wood. "Oh, holy simplicity!" said Huss. With the last feeble sounds of his voice he was heard to chant verses

of the Psalms, and to pray to the Redeemer. All the remains of the body were torn in pieces, even his clothes thrown into the fire ; the ashes were gathered and thrown into the lake, lest his disciples should make relics of them. But their faithful piety scraped together the earth around the pile, and carried it to Bohemia.¹

So perished John Huss as an obstinate incorrigible heretic, but his heresy has never been clearly defined. It was not a denial of any of the great doctrinal truths of universal Christianity, nor any of those tenets of belief rejected afterwards by the German and English Reformers. On Transubstantiation (notwithstanding the subtilties of his adversaries), the Communion in one kind, worship of the Saints and of the Virgin Mary, Huss was scrupulously, unimpeachably orthodox. He was the martyr to the power of the hierarchy, not the power of the Pope, which the Council itself had renounced in its extreme theory ; his testimony was against that supreme ecclesiastical dominion, which had so long ruled the mind of man.

Bohemia, at the news of the burning of Huss, seemed to rise with one impulse of sorrow and indignation. National and religious zeal Proceedings in Bohemia. animated all ranks, all orders. The King openly denounced the treachery of Sigismund and the barbarous injustice of the Council. The Bishop of Lieutomysse had been commanded by the Council to communicate their act, and to exhort the Bohemians to extirpate the heresies which were teeming in the kingdom. The

¹ The whole description of the last hours of Huss is from Reichenenthal and the two nameless biographers of Huss, who all were eye-witnesses. Compare L'Enfant, and Aschbach, Kaiser Sigismund.

Magnates of Bohemia met in the Chapel of Bethlehem, whose walls might still seem to sound with the eloquent
Sept. 2. preachings of Huss. An address to the Council was framed and signed by sixty of the greatest names, nobles, barons, knights, gentlemen, denouncing the execution of Huss, as inflicting perpetual infamy and disgrace on the kingdom of Bohemia and the Marquisate of Moravia. They protested that Huss was a good Catholic Christian, of the holiest conversation and most Evangelic doctrine ; a man who detested and never taught error or heresy, whose life was devoted to the edification of the people. They complained of the imprisonment, perhaps the death of the eloquent Jerome of Prague, that "illustrious philosopher," like Huss convicted of no crime, but accused, like Huss, by wicked and treacherous informers, the enemies of Bohemia. They declared that whoever averred heresies to prevail in the kingdom of Bohemia lied in his throat ; they concluded with leaving the redress of their injuries to God, who will punish the proud, being determined when the Church should be united under one supreme and undisputed pastor, to prosecute to the utmost this violation of the rights and dignity, this execution of the innocent subjects, of their realm. Strong measures were taken in a subsequent meeting to protect the Hussite priests against their Bishops. The popular
Sept. 5. fury had broken out in acts of persecution against the old clergy, and against the monks. The Emperor addressed the Bohemians in a letter, half-rebuke for their turbulent proceedings, half-apology for his own unroyal weakness in surrendering Huss to his enemies. "It was with inexpressible grief, after having more than once threatened to leave Constance, only to

avert the dissolution of the Council, that he had submitted to the decree of Christendom, represented by the whole hierarchy, and by the ambassadors of all Christian Sovereigns.”¹

But neither did the sacrifice of one victim satiate, nor the dread of the revolt of a whole kingdom arrest the severe determination of the Council to suppress by these terrible means the growing resistance to ecclesiastical rule. They would break the yoke under which themselves groaned, that of the Pope; but the more resolute were they that their own yoke should not be broken. Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, stood almost alone in assertion of the great maxim, “God willeth not the death of a sinner, but that he should be converted and live.” He almost alone condemned the punishment of death for heresy.² The Emperor had left Constance; had he remained, Jerome of Prague could show no safe-conduct on his ^{Jerome of Prague.}

part. Jerome of Prague, to the short relief of the more moderate, displayed not the stubborn courage of John Huss. Four months of weary imprisonment, in chains, in darkness, on meagre diet; the terror, as himself owned, of the stake; sickness; the bland promises of some, the awful threats of others; the persuasions of weaker friends, broke his spirit. In a public Session of the Council, Jerome of Prague appeared ^{Recants. Sept. 23.} and made a full retraction of all errors against the Catholic faith, especially those of Wycliffe and John Huss.

¹ “Neque etiam licuit nobis ulterius pro hoc negotio loqui, quia exinde concilium totaliter fuisset dissolutum.” This most remarkable letter in the Appendix to L'Enfant.

² Aschbach, p. 202, with authorities.

Instead of opening the prison doors and sending forth the strong man shorn of his strength ; if insincere or repentant of his weakness with the burden of apostasy on his conscience ; under the suspicion, if not the contempt of his partisans, who could not but contrast his pusillanimity with the unbroken resolution of Huss ; instead of placing him, as they might, in safe custody, the Council, with vengeance not less impolitic than unchristian, loaded itself with the crime of another inhuman execution, and compelled Jerome of Prague to a martyrdom hardly less noble than that of Huss. It was asserted by his implacable enemies, Michael de Causis and Stephen Palecz, that the recantation was ambiguous.

New articles were exhibited against him. The Cardinals of Cambray, Aquileia, Orsini, and Florence (Zabarella had drawn the form of retractation) with-
April 27.

drew in indignation from the commission of inquiry. But different Commissioners were named at the instigation of his two implacable adversaries. The Patriarch of Antioch and (it is sad to write) the Chancellor Gerson urged this virtual breach of faith.

May 23. Fresh charges were accumulated. Thrice was Jerome again arraigned before a General Congre-

May 26. gation. The last time he was permitted to pour forth a long declamation in his defence, he dwelt on all the great men who had been the victims of false accusation, Socrates, Seneca, Boethius, Plato, the Prophets, the Protomartyr Stephen. He ascribed his persecution to the hereditary unforgiving hatred between the Germans and Bohemians. He acknowledged some concern in the tumults in the University of Prague, when certain Germans had lost their lives.

He confessed his flight from Constance, and still further, "I confess that, moved by cowardly fear of the stake, against my conscience, I have con-^{Recants his recantation.} sented to the condemnation of the doctrines of Wycliffe and John Huss. This sinful retractation I now fully retract, and am resolved to maintain the tenets of Wycliffe and of John Huss to death, believing them to be the true and pure doctrine of the Gospel, even as their lives were blameless and holy."

From that moment Jerome of Prague resumed all his calm intrepidity. He was speedily con-^{May 30, 1416. Condemnation.} demned as a relapsed heretic. The Bishop of Lodi, doubtless as supposed to be gifted with most impressive eloquence, was again called upon to preach the funeral sermon of the heretic. His text was, "He reproached their unbelief and hardness of heart." On his own charity and that of the Council, their charity to the heretic himself, and to the rest of Christendom, for whose sake heresy was to be extirpated, the preacher was unctuous and self-adulatory. He laid down as irrefragably just the ordinary, the rightful course of procedure against all commonly reputed heretics. There should be diligent inquisition for them; they should be apprehended, placed in strong prisons. Articles should be exhibited against them, witnesses admitted, even the most infamous, usurers, ribalds, common prostitutes. The heretics should be sworn to speak the truth. If they refuse to speak, they are to be put upon the rack, and subjected to various tortures. None should be admitted to visit them, but under strong necessity; they ought not to be heard in public. If they shall recant, they are to find mercy. If obstinate, they are to be condemned and made over to the secular arm. This brief

and frightful and authoritative statement of the dominant usage is contrasted by the preacher with the magnanimous mercy of the Council to Jerome of Prague.¹

Jerome was permitted to answer ; he answered with boldness bordering on scorn. He ended thus : " You are resolved to condemn me in this wicked and iniquitous manner, without having convicted me of any crime ; but after my death I will be in your consciences an ever-gnawing worm. I appeal to the Supreme Judge, before whom ye will appear with me, ere a hundred years are passed."²

An accomplished Florentine, Poggio Bracciolini, present at the trial, has left an account of the demeanor of Jerome, which impressed him as a display of power and eloquence, almost unrivalled at any time. Emerging from a fetid dungeon, after the depression of a long confinement, with the weight of his recantation upon him, against an adverse Court, he stood his ground with wonderful copiousness, fluency, and readiness of language, and with consummate dexterity, now deeply pathetic, now with playful wit or taunting sarcasm, confounding, bewildering, overpowering his adversaries. His voice was sweet, clear, sonorous, with a certain dignity ; his gesture admirably fitted to express indignation, or to move that commiseration, which he neither sought nor cared to obtain. He stood fearless, intrepid, like another Cato, not only despising, courting death.³

¹ The whole sermon is remarkable. It is in Von der Hardt, iii. p. 35. There was a lofty burst of feudal indignation, that two men, vile plebeians of the basest sort, of unknown birth, should have convulsed the whole kingdom of Bohemia.

² L'Enfant is inclined, I think on insufficient grounds, to doubt the authenticity of these last words.

³ Poggio Bracciolini Oper.

His death was as surprising for its calmness and courage. Two days were left to permit him *Execution* to retract again. The Cardinal of Florence attempted to persuade him to submission. His countenance was constantly not only composed but cheerful.¹ He was bound naked to the stake ; he continued to sing hymns with his deep untrembling voice. The executioner offered to light the fire behind him, lest he should see it. "Light it before my face," said the martyr ; "had I the least fear, I should not be standing in this place."

There remained one case of criminal jurisprudence for the decision of this great Senate of Christendom.

Before the Council of Constance, were arraigned for different violations of the law of God and man, three persons, all, somewhat singularly, bearing the name of John. Pope John XXIII., according to the articles exhibited against him, and those articles supported by undoubted testimony, and so affirmed by the Council, and put forth as the accredited foundation of their judgment, had been guilty from his youth, and during his whole life, of the foulest crimes, being a priest of licentiousness which passes belief, promiscuous concubinage, incest, the violation of nuns ; of the most atrocious cruelties, murder, massacre, the most grinding tyranny, unglutted avarice, unblushing simony. He had rarely celebrated the solemn rites of the Church, the Holy Sacraments, and then with contemptuous neglect and indifference.² Against some of these charges John

¹ Von der Hardt. liii. 64.

² "Unus Articulus qui fuit in ordine sextus plura vitia conclusit sub hac formâ. Item quod dictus Johannes fuit et est pauperum oppressor ; justitiæ persecutor ; iniquitatum columna ; simoniacorum status ; carnis cultor ; vitiorum fex ; a virtutibus peregrinus ; infamiæ speculum et omnium malitiarum profundus admonitor ; adeo et in tantum scandalizans ecclesiam

made no defence; in some he seemed to acquiesce, only resting on the plea that they were no heresies, and that the Pope could be judged for heresy alone. John XXIII. was deposed from his Pontifical office, having fled from the Council in violation of his own most solemn protestations; he was ignominiously apprehended, and cast into prison; he was detained in dishonorable but not harsh captivity till the close of the Council. Afterwards, having ceased to be dangerous to the ruling Pope, and having humbled himself beneath his feet, he was permitted to close his days in peace, even in honor, for he was raised again to the rank of a Cardinal.

The second, John Huss, of life blameless to austerity, absolutely unimpeachable in his morals, charged only with some indirect connection with turbulent proceedings in Bohemia, with an acquittal of all heresy from the Archbishop of Prague and the Grand Inquisitor, with a safe-conduct from the Emperor, was accused of erroneous belief in Transubstantiation and the Administration of the Cup to the Laity. These charges he distinctly denied, and repelled to the satisfaction of most present: he was likewise accused of having denounced the corruptions and vices of the clergy: yet his denunciations, not to speak of those of Nicolas of Clemangis, Henry of Hessa, Theodoric à Niem, Theodore de Vrie, could hardly have surpassed in severity those of men who sat in judgment upon him, Gerson and Peter d'Ailly Cardinal of Cambray. It is difficult to define or to apprehend the precise remaining delinquencies or errors of which he was found guilty, as

Christi, quod inter Christi fideles vitam et mores cognoscentes vulgariter dicitur Diabolus Incarnatus." — Thus speaks a Council of a Pope! Gobelius, p. 341.

having adopted and propagated the condemned doctrines of Wycliffe, treated with derision, or undermined the Power of the Keys, and the absolute irrevocable authority of the clergy, and making that authority dependent not on their succession or ordination, but on their personal holiness. For these offences, notwithstanding the Imperial safe-conduct, John Huss was seized, imprisoned, burned at the stake.

The third, Jean Petit, in an acknowledged, and published, and unambiguous writing, had vindicated as just and lawful a most foul and treacherous murder. In this vindication he had laid down principles utterly subversive of human society, principles which would let loose mankind upon each other, like wild beasts; principles in direct violation of one of the Commandments of God, and in plain, bold opposition to every precept and to the whole religion of Christ.¹

Jean Petit had escaped by death all personal penalty.² The condemnation of his book by the Council of Constance, through the awe and influence of the Duke of Burgundy, was postponed, debated, at length eluded. For to condemn Jean Petit for his abstract propositions, was to condemn the act of the Duke of Burgundy. From the first the partisans of Burgundy, with the acquiescence, the servile admission of those who dared not be his enemies, acquitted the Duke of all personal participation in a crime of which all believed, all knew him to be guilty. But the Council of Constance, to its close, hesitated to pass that censure demanded and uttered by the shuddering abhorrence of mankind against the book of Jean Petit. A Council of Faith

¹ See in Monstrelet the Eight Principles of Jean Petit, li. c. xxxix.

² He died 1411; it is said repenting of his book.

at Paris, under the Archbishop and the Grand Inquisitor, had condemned the Eight Verities asserted by Jean Petit. The Council of Constance would not affirm this censure; it was even annulled on account of informality by the Cardinal Orsini and others of the same rank. The world eagerly awaited the decree of the supreme authority in Christendom on the momentous question, the legality of murder. Session after session dragged out in illimitable length. Bishops, Abbots, theologians, the Bishop of Arras, the Abbots of Clairvaux and Cîteaux, Jean de la Roche, a learned Dominican, did not scruple to undertake the contest, to allege every kind of captious objection, every subtilty of scholastic logic. These monstrous tenets were declared to be only moral and philosophical opinions, not of faith, therefore out of the province of the Church and of the Council. Gerson, the prosecutor in the name of the University of Paris, not avowedly, though known to be in secret supported by the King of France, could not but perceive the monstrous incongruity between the condemnation of John Huss for his anti-hierarchical tenets as of Faith, and the dismissal of questions which concerned the first elements of religion and the Commandments, as beyond the province of Faith. Gerson himself was involved in charges of heresy by the advocates of Jean Petit, determined at all hazards to silence their powerful antagonist. With difficulty a condemnation was extorted of one broad and general proposition. "It is lawful and even meritorious in any vassal or subject to kill a tyrant, either by stratagem, by blandishment, flattery, or force, notwithstanding any oath or covenant sworn with him, without awaiting the sentence or authority

of any judge.”¹ Yet even this censure was annulled, as wanting in form, by the new Pope. Nothing could induce Martin V. to condemn in full Council either the propositions of Jean Petit, or kindred doctrines which had been published in Poland.² Even the memory of the third John escaped unscathed from any authoritative proscription by Council or by Pope. But Gerson, the learned, pious Gerson dared not return to Paris, now in the power of Burgundy and the English; he lay hid for a time in Germany, lingered out a year or two at Lyons, and died a proscribed and neglected exile; finding his only consolation, no doubt full consolation, in the raptures of his Holy Mysticism.³

¹ Von der Hardt, iv. 442; L'Enfant, p. 408.

² L'Enfant, ii. 212; Gerson. Opera, v. 1014.

³ “Synodo finitâ Joannes Gersonius, tot laborum suorum, insignisque pietatis, ac in justitiam ac verum ardentissimi amoris, non aliud præmium consecutus est, quam perpetuum exilium.” — Dupin, Vit. Gerson. p. xxxvi.

CHAPTER X.

CLOSE OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE. POPE MARTIN V.

YET by these acts (the affair of Jean Petit dragged on its close) the Council of Constance had only commenced its proper work, the Reformation of the Church and the election of a Pope. Nor had the Fathers approached the solution of the great difficulty, which of these was to take precedence. This question involved another perhaps of higher moment. Could the Church legally reform itself without a Pope? Was it complete, invested in full power of action without a head? Nor, though John XXIII. was removed, was the ground clear for the election of a new Pope. There were still two Popes, who had not absolutely abandoned their claims; and whose ambassadors had been admitted by the Council. Gregory XII., friendless, worn out, made no resistance; indeed, before the election of the new Pope he had relieved the Council by his death. But the Spaniard, Benedict XIII., was impracticable. Month after month for above a year he fought with firmness, which might have been admired in a better cause. The Emperor met at Perpignan the Kings of Arragon, Castile, and Navarre. Benedict refused a safe-conduct addressed to him only as a Cardinal; he would appear but as Pope in his Pontifical robes.

Two great
questions.

Benedict
XIII.

Aug. 81.

He appeared, fled, appeared again. His demands were as exorbitant as if he still divided the world. He would have the Council of Pisa annulled, the Council of Constance broken up, a new and more impartial tribunal summoned. He would cede, and he would not cede; he would dictate, not receive laws of reform. Again he fled to Collaria, a strong fortress Nov. 2. near the sea. He was besieged by the deputies of the Spanish cities. He withdrew to the more impregnable Peniscola.

At Narbonne certain capitulations were framed; according to which the Kings of Arragon, Dec. 12. Castile, Navarre, and the Count de Foix renounced their obedience to Benedict. The Spaniards joined the Council, they formed a fifth Nation. Benedict, deserted by his Cardinals, cited again and Jan. 1417. again, declared contumacious, accused, condemned, deposed, to the last adhered to himself. Two Benedictine monks brought him the summons of the March 8. Council. "Are ye the ravens returned to April 1. the Ark? No wonder that the ravens gather where the dead body is!" He received the sentence with the utmost impatience, threw back on the Council the charge of schism, and broke out, striking his chair with violence, "Not at Constance, the Church is at Peniscola." He created two new Cardinals, maintained the forms of state, and not till some years after died at Peniscola as obstinate and unyielding as he had lived.

The deposition of Benedict brought the two contending parties into direct conflict. On the Divisions in the Council. all-important but undecided question, the Cardinals, on one side, insisted that no reform could be valid, authoritative, complete, unless by the Church in

her full and perfect capacity, with a Pope at her head. The Emperor, supported by the Germans and English, was determined not to let slip the golden opportunity for reform, unembarrassed if not by the natural repugnance, by all the forms and difficulties inseparable from the Papal assent. They maintained the imperious necessity of reform in the head as well as in the members. The Pope himself must submit to the salutary restrictions imposed on the rest of the hierarchy; and could that be expected, could it be extorted from an actual

August. ruling Pope? Menacing and ominous signs
September. of division began to appear. The Cardinals protested against proceeding to any reform unauthorized by a Pope; the Germans and the English were accused of heresy, for promulgating such dangerous doctrines. The Emperor took the strong measure of prohibiting the separate meetings of the Cardinals.

At this juncture, the death of Robert Hallam, Sept. 4.
Death of Robert Hallam. Bishop of Salisbury, changed the whole state of affairs. On his wisdom, on his resolute firmness, the Emperor had relied; his authority held together the Germans and the English. The French, from hatred of the English, had somewhat cooled in their ardent zeal for reform; they had even contested the right of the English to vote, especially after the arrival of the Spaniards, as one of the Nations. In D'Ailly the Cardinal prevailed over the Reformer. Two of the more distinguished German Prelates were brought over. Wallenrod of Riga received the wealthy Bishopric of Liege, with its principedom, Abondi of Coire the Archbishopric of Riga.¹ Only a few days after

¹ Von der Hardt, iv. 1432-1440. Probably, after the consent to the election, as a reward.

Hallam's death the English fell off to the Italian party; the Emperor was compelled to assent to the election of a Pope, upon the specious but precarious resolution that the Pope should stipulate to reform the Church before the dissolution of the Council. The angry feud between the Emperor and the Cardinals was allayed by the good offices of Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester (uncle of King Henry VI.), on his return from the Holy Land, and so invested with a kind of holy influence.

Great bodies are apt, when weary of the tardy and encumbered progress of affairs, to rush on in headlong precipitation, and to accomplish in reckless haste what might seem to require the most grave and slow deliberation. They waste years in debate, and then do desperately in a few days or hours the most important acts. The hard-wrung consent of the Emperor was given on the last day of September. The inevitable contests as to the form of election were over in one month. On the 30th of October (at its Fortieth Session) the Council made its last effort for independent life. It declared that it was not to be dissolved till the Pope had granted reform. On the 8th of November those who were to be joined with the Cardinals in the privilege of election (this concession the Council had demanded and obtained) were named. Twenty-three Cardinals and thirty Delegates of the Council entered the Conclave. The strife was sharp but short. On the 11th of November, an Italian, a Roman, a noble ^{Election of} ^{Martin V.} of the house of Colonna, had united the suffrages; the Cardinal Colonna, elected on St. Martin's day, took the name of Martin V.¹

¹ "Quod autem in Papam electus est ille, qui de Collegio Cardinalium
VOL. VII. 33

The election of the Pope woke the whole Council to a paroxysm of joy. He was at once invested in the Papal robes, and placed on the altar, where eager throngs hasted to kiss his feet. The Emperor prostrated himself before the Pontiff, and paid that act of reverential homage. Throughout the rest of the ceremonial of the inauguration Constance vied with Rome in its pomp, and in its adherence to the ancient formularies, as far as could be done in a strange city. The immense multitudes, which might more fairly be supposed to represent Christendom, made up for the sacred emotions inseparable from Rome. If the Minster of Constance but poorly represented the time-hallowed Lateran, the fantastic St. Maria Maggiore, the Apostolic Church of St. Peter, yet the inexhaustible crowds of all nations, Kings, Princes, Burghers, Prelates, Clergy of all the kingdoms of Europe, might add even greater dignity to the ceremony than the so-called Consuls, Senators, Magistrates, and populace of Rome.

The Cardinal Otto Colonna was a man in elevating whom conflicting parties might meet without the humiliation of a compromise. Of the highest birth, irreproachable morals, with the reputation of learning in the Canon Law, in only two points he had departed from the most calm moderation, in both with the full sympathies of the Council. He had been strenuous for the condemnation of Huss; he had adhered to, had even followed Pope John in his flight; but this would

obedientiæ Urbani Papæ descendit, Spiritus Sanctus quodam mysterio singulari egisse præsumitur: cum id quod prius ira, odium, insidia et protervitas et ultio dubium facti temporis diuturnitate subortum, de Papatus justa possessione discerni non siverant, hoc jam totius mundi consensus simpliciter in cordibus veritatem et justitiam diligenter scintillaret." — Gobelius, p. 344.

find excuse as an act of generous fidelity to the ruling Pontiff and to a falling friend. In all other respects he had held a middle course with great dignity ; no stern adversary of reformation, no alarming fanatic for change. He was courteous in manners, short and sententious in speech, quick and dexterous yet cautious in business, a strict and even ostentatious lover of justice. His enemies could only assert that much craft lurked under his moderation ; later in life his prudence degenerated into avarice. The conduct of the Pope, until the dissolution of the Council, the dissolution of the Council without any great general measure of reform, while he avoided all serious offence to the Emperor or to the more formidable advocates of reform, display the great sagacity, the consummate policy of Martin V.

Yet in his first act Martin might seem to throw off his moderation, and to declare hastily and imperiously his determination to maintain all ^{First act of Martin V.} the existing abuses. The Papal chancery had been the object of the longest, loudest, and most just clamor. The day after the election, the Pope published a Brief confirming all the regulations established by his predecessors, even by John XXIII.¹ All the old grievances,

¹ On the regulations of the Roman Chancery, see Eichhorn, iii. p. 511, note. To the Chancery belonged the preparation and expedition of all Briefs and Bulls, appeals, negotiations. The Dataria was originally a branch of the Chancery ; from the Dataria came all grants, gifts, appointments to benefices. The head of the whole was the Protonotarius or Primicerius, called also Corrector of the Papal Letters. There was a College of Abbreviators, 12 de parco majori, 22 de parco minori (from these were the Rescribendarius, the Taxatores who fixed the price of Briefs or Bulls, and the Plumbator who held the seal), the rest, making up 72, might be laymen or married men, and were called examiners. The first wore the violet dress of bishops. There were three courts of justice, the Rota, the Signatura Justitiæ, and Signatura Gratiæ. All this vast incorporation was maintained by the fees of office.

Reservations, Expectancies, Vacancies, Confirmations of Bishops, Dispensations, Exemptions, Commendams, Annates, Tenths, Indulgences,¹ might seem to be adopted as the irrevocable law of the Church.² The

¹ The decree is in Von der Hardt, i. p. 955 *et seq.*, L'Enfant, ii. 415-426; countersigned by the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Nov. 12, 1417, published, with severe penalties for its infringement, Feb. 26, 1418.

² The right of the Holy See to appoint to all benefices, out of which gradually grew up all these abuses of Reservations, Provisions, Dispensations, Annates, Commendams, Pluralities, was unknown till the twelfth century. The prerogative might seem necessarily vested in the universal Bishop, enabling him, by his higher episcopal authority, to place the worthiest men in every office or function of the Universal Church. Its first exercise appears to have been, when on the removal, the deposition, or degradation of any unfit, criminal, or heretical dignitary, the right might devolve * on the supreme arbiter (these were mostly cases of appeal) to substitute some worthier prelate. Hadrian IV. began to recommend spiritual persons to the bishops for preferment. These *prayers* with his successors grew into mandates: the haughty Alexander III. not merely issued those mandates, but sent his officers to enforce their execution.† It was an early usage, too, that when a prelate or high dignitary died at Rome, the Pope and the Roman Court in their abundant charity would send a successor from Rome for the consolation of the widowed Church.‡

Innocent III. first asserted for the Supreme Pontiff the plenary power of disposing of all benefices, for the advantage of such persons as should have deserved well of the See of Rome.§ From this time Bulls for the appointment of such prelates bear the significant words of "our plenary authority:" and the more sweeping "notwithstanding," which at once annulled all existing rights, privileges, prescriptions of rightful patrons. The Papal Legates were invested in the same high powers;|| in them, if they deemed it necessary to put forth their power, was the derivative authority to summon any ecclesiastic to any office or dignity. As yet it was the haughty assertion on special occasions only, and occasions in many cases such as might seem to justify the Papal interference and the exercise of this all-embracing prerogative. We have seen Stephen Langton seated on the throne of Canterbury by this title, in vain contested by the King, admitted by the world. Clement IV. fifty years later specially reserved for the Papal nomination all benefices of which the possessors died at Rome.¶ That

* This was called "*jus devolutionis*."

† See Eichhorn, iii. p. 507, *Preces, Mandata*.

‡ "*In Consolationem de obitu defuncti*." — *Ibid*.

§ Planck, iv. p. 721.

|| "*De officio Legati*." — *Regest.* c. 6, x.

¶ "*Licet . . . beneficiorum . . . plenaria dispositio ad Romanum non*

form was not less dictatorial than the substance of the decree. It was an act of the Pope, not of the Council.

which was a proud prerogative, exercised so far with some modesty, and with some respect for the high purposes for which it was assumed, with the Avignonese Pontiffs and their successors became a wanton and arbitrary authority, exercised for the aggrandizement of the Pope's power and the Pope's wealth. Already Clement V. reserved for himself, out of his love for his former see, the archbishopric and certain abbeys in Bordeaux. John XXII. not only extended the special reservation to whole dioceses, Aquileia, Milan, Ravenna, Genoa, and Pisa, but, as we have seen, proclaimed the Papal reservation of all benefices vacated by promotions through the grace of the Roman See. We have seen, too, that John XXII. endeavored by one sweeping edict to strip all pluralists of their execrable and unholy accumulation of preferments, and to secure their spoils, as Reserves, for himself and the Holy See. We have seen how out of the Reservations arose the *Expectatives*, granted with such lavish prodigality by the Italian Popes who succeeded to those of Avignon; with the not less lucrative creation of *vacancies*.

With the reservation of benefices, and still more with the right of confirmation of bishops — a right asserted, and more or less rigidly exercised, since the twelfth century — was closely connected the right of the taxation of benefices. The tax assumed the name of Annates, as calculated on the annual revenue of the benefice. It was levied as a fee on consecration upon every bishop confirmed in Rome. At first it was confined to prelaties. Clement V. extended this privilege of paying a year's income to all benefices in England. John XXII. extended it throughout Christendom for three years only, on account of the pressing necessities of the Roman Church; * but those necessities ceased not to be urgent: the three years grew into a perpetuity.† Towards the end of the fourteenth century it became a tax, the fees on confirmation must be paid over and above. Thus the Papal Chancery held a roll of assessment of the value of almost all benefices in Christendom: this ecclesiastical valuation was raised from time to time, as not only the annates, the first-fruits, but the tenths, which were occasionally commanded or granted were collected according to this cataster.‡ In the same manner the Pope seized, what Kings had claimed, the possessions left by the clergy, and the produce of vacant benefices.

The plenary power which could bestow, could *dispense* with the duties of all benefices. It could permanently unite contiguous and poor benefices; it could excuse, on the pretext of higher duties, the duties of the men-

catur Pontificem pertinere . . . collationem tamen . . . beneficiorum, apud Sedem Romanam vacantium, specialius cæteris antiqua consuetudo R. P. reservavit."

— B. Clement. IV.

* Compare above, p. 119; Eichhorn, iii. p. 507.

† They were likewise called "*servitia communia et minuta*."

‡ Extravagant. Cap. ii. de Prebend.

It was throughout the Pope who enacted and ordained ; it was the absolute resumption of the whole power of Reformation, so far at least as the Papal Court, into his own hands. Whatever he might hereafter concede to the Church in general, or to the separate nations of Christendom, was a boon on his part, not a right on theirs. Did the secret of this bold measure really lurk in this — that it appeared to be and was received as a declaration against all reform ?

The Council saw its fatal error. In creating a Pope of high character, it had given itself a master. It might dictate to a John XXIII., it must submit to Martin V. The Emperor himself had fallen into the second rank ; the Pope took his seat as of course President of the Council. They were at the Pope's mercy. Their only hope was that his magnanimity, his gratitude, or his zeal for religion might prevail over his jealous care of his supremacy, that precious trust which had been handed down by so many generations of Popes, the unlimited Vicegerency of God.

Yet the Nations would not abandon or relax their

ber of the Capitular Body, of the parish Priest, even of the Bishop. Who but the Head of the Church could judge what was for the benefit of the Church ? If this could be done in benefices with cure of souls, how much more when it was only the rule of a monastery, the seat in or the presidency of a Chapter, the stately and almost inactive charge of the Abbot, or the regular and ritual duty of the Canon or the Prebendary ? Here the Prior, there the Vicar, might go through with sufficient decency the scanty or the mechanical services in the church, dream in the cloister, chant in the choir. The Pope would therefore less scruple to accumulate such benefices on his Cardinals, his officers, his courtiers, his favorites, whom he could commend to the formal election of the Chapter or the Monks, and permit to hold (in commendam), without once having visited the Convent or the Chapter, the Prebend, the Deanery, the portion of one or more monks, the Priorate, the Abbacy. Thus was all bound together in one complicated but subtly-enwoven system ; and now wrested by the dexterous craft of Martin V. out of the hands of the spoiler.

strenuous efforts for reform. The Germans presented a strong memorial ; it contained eighteen articles, limiting the number of Cardinals, placing the Papal power under severe restrictions as to collation of benefices, Annates, Reservations, Appeals, the abuses of the Chancery and the Penitentiary, Exemptions, Unions, Commendams.¹ The French had been at first the most bold and earnest in their denunciations against the abuses in the Church. Gerson, the Cardinal d'Ailly, Nicolas Clemangis,² had uttered terrible truths in language hardly less violent than Wycliffe or Huss. They had entreated the Emperor to enforce reform. Sigismund bitterly replied, "When we urged that reform should precede the election of a Pope, you scorned our judgment and insisted on first having a Pope. Lo, you have a Pope, implore him for reform. I had some power before a Pope was chosen, now I have none."³

¹ L'Enfant gives the articles, iii. p. 186, *et seq.*

² De Clemangis, from Clemange, a village in the diocese of Chalons. See life prefixed to his Works, by Dupin, *Gersoniana*. Also his works, *passim*, more especially his *Declamatio de Corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu*. This must be read as a declamation. Clemangis begins with a golden age of the Church and of the world ; as brilliant as their state in his own day was blackly colored. His remorseless scourge spares neither Pope, nor Cardinals, nor Bishops, nor Priests, nor Monks, nor Friars, nor Nuns. No one can judge what things were written, and not by heresiarchs, but by pious churchmen, who does not read this work of Clemangis, the scholar of Gerson. "Si quis hodie desidiosus est, si quis a labore abhorrens, si quis in otio luxuriari volens, ad sacerdotium convolat, quo adepto, statim se cæteris sacerdotibus voluptatum sectatoribus adjungit, qui magis secundum Epicurum quam secundum Christum viventes, et cauponulas seduli frequentantes potando, commessando, pransitando, convivendo cum tessera et pilâ ludendo tempora tota consumunt. Crapulati verò et inebriati pugnant, clamant, tumultuantur, nomen Dei et Sanctorum suorum pollutissimis labris execrantur. Sicque tandem compositi, ex meretricum suarum amplexibus ad divinum altare veniunt." — *Oper. t. xvi. p. 16.* See further on the corruption of French morals by the Papal court at Avignon ; the Pluralities of the Cardinals.

³ Gobelinus Persona, vi. p. 345.

The Spaniards even threatened to return to the obedience of Pope Benedict ; but they exhausted all their indignation in violent satires, which obtained great currency and vogue, were laughed at, and forgotten.¹

The Pope acted with perfect address. He seemed to yield in the amplest manner. He submitted to the Nations a counter plan of Reformation, each article of which might have occupied the weary Council for months of hot debate. In the mean time, on the old maxim of ruling by the division of the adverse forces, he entered into negotiations for separate Concordats with each of the Transalpine nations. Italy had acquiesced at once in the Papal autocracy. Each of the other Nations had its usages, its institutions, its national character ; each Nation, therefore, ought to have its peculiar ecclesiastical regulations, as concerned its relations to the Papacy. Thus it was no longer Christendom, no longer the whole Church, no longer the Council, the representative of the Church, which was confronted with the Pope. Each kingdom stood alone to make the best terms in its power. So, too, the infringement, neglect, abrogation, of any of these articles, was no longer a breach of the great Canonical Law of Christendom, it became a matter of quarrel with one King, or one Nation, it concerned none other ; it awoke no general indignation, was no breach of faith to the world at large. The League of Christendom for its common rights, common interests, common religion, was broken in pieces.

The Concordat with Germany (limited to five years)
Concordat with Ger- was vague, ambiguous, and left almost every-
many; thing to the interpretation of the Pope. Car-

¹ L'Enfant, ii. p. 190.

dinals were to be elected in moderate numbers. Some limitation was placed, but that indefinite, on the Pope's right of nominating to and confirming the larger vacant Benefices. Annates were to be levied according to the ancient taxation; Commendams were to be bestowed, Dispensations issued, Indulgences granted in more sparing and prudent measure.¹

That with England contained six even more meagre articles. Two of these stipulated that the ^{with Eng-} inferior Prelates were not to wear the ^{land;} decorations of the higher—the mitre and sandals; that Englishmen should be admissible to offices in the Roman Court.

Nor was that with France, though more diffuse, more full or unambiguous. No one of the ^{with France.} nations by any authoritative act accepted these Concordats. France, by a royal edict, by a decree of her Parliaments, rejected hers with contempt.² It was presented by Martin, Bishop of Arras, before the Parliament of Paris, repudiated with unanimity.³ The Parliament proclaimed the maintenance of the liberties of the Gallican Church, especially as to the collation of benefices, though prepared to contribute to the maintenance of the Popedom by moderate and necessary payments: it prohibited with the utmost rigor all payments whatever for Provisions, Annates, Vacancies, and such usurped powers.

It does not appear that the King or the Parliament of England deigned to notice the treaty passed in her

¹ Art. de Indulgentiis. "Cavebit Romanus Papa in futurum nimiam Indulgentiarum effusionem, ne vilescant."

² Preuves des Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, c. xxii. No. 16.

³ Von der Hardt, iv. 1567.

name; her stern liminary laws stood unshaken, unrepealed.¹

The work of the Council was done, or rather it had now no work to do. The Council was as anxious to be released from its weary imprisonment as the Pope to release it. The Council felt itself baffled, eluded, fallen under the inextricable dominion of the Pope. The Emperor was conscious that he had sunk to a subordinate position; his majesty was eclipsed. On the occasion of his solemn farewell the bitterness of his heart seemed to creep out. He declared his full obedience to the Pope; his submission to all the decrees of the Council. But if the Council had fallen into error he disclaimed all concern in it.² These significant words would bear various meanings, and were variously interpreted as alluding to the execution of Huss, the refusal to condemn Jean Petit and John of Falkenburg who in Poland had asserted the same execrable doctrines, the failure in the reformation of the Church. That miserable failure was admitted in all quarters.³ The Pope kept up to the last his grave and stately dignity. On Whitsunday he officiated in the Cathedral with high pomp; countless multitudes thronged all

¹ Compare the treatise of Clemangis, "*De Annatis non Solvendis*." He lays down the axiom, "*Quia nullo statuto, privilegio, consuetudine, prescriptione, aut alio titulo potest induci, quod propter conferre aut consentire promotioni, aut electioni alicujus Monasterii vel Ecclesiæ Cathedralis, sive ut præficiatur administrationi prælaturæ, beneficio, sive Ecclesiæ, aliquid posset vel debeat peti vel exigi, eo quod secundum Apostolicas et Canonicas traditiones, clarissime foret Simoniacum.*" It is curious that there is frequent appeal to English usage. — Oper. p. 85.

² Von der Hardt, iv. p. 1563. *L'Enfant*, ii. 248.

³ "*Sunt tamen quædam reformatæ, quamvis respectu conceptorum pauca, verbis quidem et scriptis quæ propter humanam mentis mutabilitatem, divinitatis excusantem se sub umbrâ, hic inserere non præsumo.*" — *Goëbelinus Persona*, p. 355.

night around the Episcopal Palace to receive his benediction: he showered indulgences on the enraptured thousands. The next day he set off for Geneva escorted by the Emperor, the whole city, and all the hierarchy who had not already taken their departure. He had refused the Emperor's pressing invitations to remain longer in Germany. The Council of Constance was at an end.¹

The Council of Constance threatened to shake, might seem to have shaken, the Papal supremacy to its foundations; but for a time it strengthened rather than enfeebled its authority. It compelled the election of a Pope, whose character, irreproachable, if not imposing from learning and sanctity, recovered the waning reverence of Christendom. Nor was it till the next century, when the Popes had become powerful temporal sovereigns, when the Italian wars had almost quenched the last awe of religion, when the struggle for dominion between the great conflicting powers of Europe, France, the Empire, Spain, England, made Italy the battle-field of the world; it was not till then that the Popes sunk again to the moral level, or lower than the level of Italian Princes or temporal potentates, and that an Alexander VI. could be endured on the throne of St. Peter. It had been established indeed that there was a tribunal which in extreme cases might depose a Pope. But then it must be during a schism among contending Popes, each with a doubtful title, or at farthest a Pope flagrantly defective in faith or morals. But the right in the Council to reform the Church in its head as well

¹ The Council had sat for three years and six months without a tumult in the streets, without rise in the price of provisions, without any epidemic or contagious malady.

as its members, to impose restrictions on the all-enacting, all-abrogating, all self-executing power of the Popedom, this right, which there can be no doubt was asserted by the Council, remained a barren, abstract proposition, to be again asserted, but asserted in vain, in the Council of Basle. Still the Pope claimed, he exercised the prerogative of issuing Canons for the universal obedience of Christendom, and of giving to Papal Decrees the infallible authority of the Gospel, of God himself. Pope Martin quietly resumed all the unrevoked authority which the Christian world had yielded to Innocent III., or even to Boniface VIII. No single Canon, not one of the Extravagants of Boniface, not one even of the Clementine Decretals was annulled; every precedent remained in force. The Concordats granted by the will of the Pope, feeble guarantees as they were for the liberties of national churches, or against abuses, might be abrogated or fall into desuetude. Of what force were they against what was averred to be the ancient, immemorial, irrevocable privileges of the Roman See?

The Council had given its sanction, its terrible sanction, to the immutability of the whole dominant creed of Christendom, to the complete indefeasible hierarchical system. It had declared implacable war against all who should revolt, not only from the doctrine but from the discipline of the Church. One part of the sacerdotal order might aspire to greater freedom, but the slightest emancipation of mankind from the rule of the sacerdotal order entered not into the thoughts, hardly into the apprehensions, of the Fathers of Constance. In the execution of Huss and Jerome of Prague there had been awful unanimity. Few foresaw, still fewer

had they foreseen would have shrunk from, the horrors of the Bohemian war, in which it was first shown in a whole nation, how much more dreadful is the collision of hostile fanaticisms than the worst strife of temporal interests or principles. Bohemia as a province of the Christian world in insurrection against the unity of the Church, was even more beyond the pale of mercy than a heathen land. The Christian duty, the Christian justice of enforcing belief in the Gospel on the wild and yet unconverted races in the North of Germany was debated, and with strong resistance, by the more tolerant. Few of those who fought, or drove others to fight, with Ziska and Procopius, doubted the holiness, the imperative obligation of battling against these heresiarchs to the death.

Martin V. travelled slowly through Italy. He accepted the splendid hospitalities of Florence, Martin at Florence. now at the height of her power, and proud to Feb. 20, 1419. receive the Supreme Pontiff as her guest. The grateful, yet poor or parsimonious Pope, had no other return to make but the elevation of Florence to an Archiepiscopate. At Florence John XXIII. having, by the Pope's desire, been transferred from a German to an Italian prison, though he had once made his escape, now quieted the apprehensions of his rival by throwing himself at his feet, expressing the deepest contrition for all his sins, and abdicating his last hold on the May 13.

Papacy in the most full and humiliating terms. Martin felt the policy as well as the generosity of mercy. Balthasar Cossa, after a few days of austere penance, was named Cardinal and Head of the Sacred College. But his eventful life drew to its end: he Death of John XXIII.; died, worn out; it was said that his last

humiliation preyed on his weary spirit. He was buried with great pomp at the expense of the Republic. His tomb is still seen under the noble dome of Florence.

of Benedict XIII. Benedict XIII. closed at length his stubborn career at Peniscola. He had still two partisans, whom he dignified with the name of Cardinals; faithful to the memory of their patron the two Cardinals proceeded to elect a successor, a canon of Barcelona. Martin was wise enough to dispel this phantom of a Pontiff by mild measures. The Antipope sunk willingly into the Bishop of Majorca.

Martin was undisputed Pope; but in the Papal territory he was not master of a single city. Besides the kingdoms and dukedoms, Naples and Milan, the Republics, Venice and Florence, the independent lords of other cities, a new Power had arisen to still greater height — the Captains of the Free Companies, who had carved themselves out principalities, which they maintained by the bands of their mercenary followers. Braccio Montone occupied the greater part of the Papal dominions.¹ Pope Martin had recognized the title of Joanna II., the inheritress of the name, the throne, the licentiousness, the misfortunes of Joanna I., to the throne of Naples. In return the famous Condottiero, Ludovico Sforza, hereafter to be more famous, now at the head of his own bands and those of Naples, advanced as Gonfalonier of the Church to expel Braccio Montone from the territory of St. Peter. But Sforza, or rather Sforza's ally Tartaglia, whom he had

¹ Of Braccio Montone, Æneas Sylvius writes that one side of his body was palsied. He was eloquent and facetious. "Blandus eloquio, crudelis opere. De clavibus Ecclesiæ, de Christo, de Deo nihil timuit, ut qui animam cum corpore extingui Epicurea dementia credidit." — Vit. Freder. III. apud Kollar, ii. p. 1541.

seduced from Braccio, suffered a disastrous defeat; the Pope was compelled to make terms, through the mediation of Florence, with the triumphant Braccio.¹ To Florence Braccio came; the fickle city contrasted the magnificence, the frank bearing, the lavish expenditure, the feasts and tournaments of the adventurer, with the cold and severe dignity, the poverty of the Pontiff. Popular songs were current to the glory of the soldier, the shame of the Pope. The children sung two verses under the window, which taunted at once his worthlessness and his penury.² Martin made haste to reconcile the powerful Braccio with the Church. Braccio restored Orvieto, Narni, Terni, and Orta to the Pope; he held as a fief under the sovereignty of the Church Perugia, Assisi, Iesi, Todi, and other towns. He compelled Bologna to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Pope, and to admit a Papal garrison. June, 1420.

It was not till late in the following year that Pope Martin ventured to return to his native city Sept. 22, 1421. to the palace of the Popes. The Roman and the Pope might behold with the profoundest sorrow the state of the Eternal City. It was difficult to say during many late years whether the presence or the absence of her Pontiffs had been most disastrous. On every side he be-

¹ Muratori, sub ann. 1419. Braccio affected to become a sort of Cæsar. He is reported to have said that he would reduce Pope Martin so low that he would say six masses for a piece of silver. A Florentine reproached Braccio with this speech. "Six masses for a piece of silver! I would not give him a piece of copper for a thousand." See the account of his death and burial. — *Æneas Sylvius*, *ibid.*

² "Papa Martino,
Non vale un quattrino."
Pope Martin,
Not worth a farthing.

Muratori, Ann. sub ann.

held tottering houses, churches in ruins, deserted streets, the whole city a mass of filth and rubbish, the inhabitants wasting away with poverty and dearth of provisions.¹ The citizens looked like strangers, or like an immigration of the dregs of all people. An inundation of the Tiber, of more than usual height and violence, soon after his arrival, added to the wretchedness; the waters came up to the high altar of the Pantheon. If there were great discontents in the Papal territories at the heavy taxation; if the Pope was accused, and too justly accused, in his latter days of avarice, and of having left a vast treasure in the hands of his kindred;² if he infringed, for the sake of filling

Martin in
Rome.

¹ Platina, Vit. Martini V.

² Voigt has printed, in the *Historisches Taschenbuch* for 1833, a very curious paper, called "Stimmen aus Rom über dem Papstlichen Hof im 15ten Jahrhundert." It is compiled from more than 100 inedited letters from the ambassadors or procurators of the Teutonic Order at Rome. They were mostly written by persons who had long resided there, and are confidential, business-like, passionless letters. These ambassadors at first lived in great state; had 2000 ducats income; they had nine horses and a mule (the Cardinals were constantly borrowing their horses). In 1430 they were cut down to six, to the great diminution, as they remonstrate, of their influence. The ambassador of the Hospitallers had but three horses, and their affairs could not get on at all. The ambassador of the Teutonic Order was always in special connection with some one Cardinal, the protector of the Order (p. 89, &c.). The protector was to be propitiated and kept to his duty by perpetual and very costly presents in money, plate, jewels, horses. On those gifts there are many very curious particulars. So, too, on the venality of all, from the Pope and Cardinals downwards. One, after many others in like tone, sums up in one brief sentence: "Wer da mehr giebt der hat auch mehr recht" (p. 97). "'How is it,'" writes one ambassador, "you inquire, 'that the Poles have everything their own way?' Because they spend more money. This year" — 1411, before the Council of Constance — "they have spent 20,000 ducats. . . . The Pope has yearly from the Order 400 ducats." . . . In 1420 (Pope Martin is on the throne), "the Pope has said thrice to me, 'Come to me alone, without your Cardinal; I will be protector of the Order.' I knew well what he meant, and sent him a handsome present, as a welcome on his return to Rome. He took it most willingly" (p. 101). In 1429 the Pope

the Papal coffers, on the Concordats extorted from him at Constance; in Rome if he treated the Cardinals with overbearing haughtiness, even harshness,¹ Martin V. was honored during his life, and after a pontificate of fourteen years followed to his splendid sepulchre by the whole people of Rome, by the clergy of all ranks, lamenting the Father of the city. Rome under him had risen from her ruins, populous, prosperous, again the capital of the Christian world.

During the whole of this period the Colonna, of one of the old princely houses of Italy, the lord of a great territory, the Pope, could not but ^{Italian} ^{politics.} be mingled up in the intricate, versatile, and treacherous politics of Italy. Martin, not more embarrassed than the other temporal sovereigns, or the ambitious Republics, by gratitude to allies or fidelity to treaties, in the renewed strife between the houses of Arragon and Anjou for the throne of Naples, in the long wars between the Visconti, Duke of Milan, and Venice and Florence, calmly pursued his own interests and those of his See. The Papal territories, if heavily burdened

claimed the right of appointing a Master of the Order, as every one saw, to bring more money to himself. "One or two Cardinals can do nothing; we must reach the Pope himself, which cannot be done without money and presents." The Pope was very jealous of the presentation to all the benefices in Prussia and Livonia possessed by the Order: he would have them or their worth in money. See, too, the list of Christmas-boxes to the Pope, Cardinals, and others (p. 107): — A blue velvet cloth for the Pope, 88 ducats; a gold cup, 64 ducats; 13 silver spoons for the Pope's chamberlains, 117 ducats . . . Comfits for the Cardinals and Auditors, 70 and 31 ducats . . . for the Pope's groom, 3 ducats; a horse for a present, 30 ducats. Each Pope had his favorite, who was bribed at a higher price; with Martin V., first, the Patriarch of Grado — later, Herman, his Protonotary (p. 128). The whole correspondence is very unfavorable to Martin V., to his pride and rapacity (p. 171).

¹ See on, p. 537.

with imposts, at least escaped the ravages of foreign war, and were no longer desolated by the wanton pillage of the Free Companies. Bologna alone rose for her freedom; but the signal was not hailed by the neighboring cities. The Bentivogli came into power, but were obliged to acknowledge at least the restricted lordship of the Pope. They were goaded to a second insurrection by the massacre of some of their house by the Legate, and a second time under Eugenius IV. reconciled to the Church.

Towards Transalpine Christendom Martin V., safe on his throne at Rome, resumed all the haughty demeanor and language of former Pontiffs. He interfered in the disposal of the wealthy benefices of Germany. In England he heard with indignation, and endeavored by the most vigorous remonstrances to repress, the growing spirit of independence. The Church in England had plunged headlong into the wars of France. If the Primate Chicheley¹ did not instigate, he urged, he justified the iniquitous claim of Henry V. to the throne of France. The lavish subsidies of the Church were bestowed with unexampled readiness and generosity for these bloody campaigns. It was more than gratitude to the House of Lancaster for their firm support of the Church, and the statute for burning heretics; it was a deliberate diversion, a successful one, of the popular passions to a foreign war,

¹ Archbishop Chicheley was ambassador to Gregory XII. at Sienna; at Lucca he was appointed by the Pope, by way of provision, Bishop of St. David's. He was at the Council of Pisa, and assenting to the degradation of Gregory XII. He was Archbishop of Canterbury, 1414. The Pope claimed the right of provision, but named the prelate designated by the crown, and elected by the Monks.—*Life of Chicheley*. London, 1789.

from their bold and resolute aggressions on the Church.¹ What torrents of blood could be too deep, what amount of misery too great to avert such danger! But the Church in England had enough to do to look to itself; it could not be equally vigilant or self-sacrificing for the interests of the Pope. Henry V. like his predecessor, and his Parliament, held the law in their own hands. The nation fully concurred, or had rather enforced the constitutional opposition to the Papal power. The Statute of Præmunire remained among the laws of the realm. It could no longer be over-^{Statute of Præmunire.}looked by the Church of Rome. To Chicheley, still Archbishop of Canterbury, Martin addressed a grave missive, reproving in the harshest terms his criminal remissness, his treacherous cowardice.² "By this execrable statute the King of England has so entirely usurped the spiritual jurisdiction, as if our Saviour had constituted him his Vicar. He makes laws for the Church and the Order of the Clergy; draws the cognizance of ecclesiastical causes to the temporal courts; makes provision about clerks, benefices, and the concerns of the hierarchy, as if he held the keys of the kingdom of heaven, as if the administration of

¹ Shakspeare in the first scene of Henry V. speaks the language of the chronicles, the chronicles the language of history. The allusion to the famous petition, which the poet makes a bill (see above, p. 414), is curious. Is there Parliamentary authority for this? —

"That self-same Bill is urged,
Which in the eleventh year of the last king's reign
Was like and had indeed against us passed,
But that the scrambling and unquiet time
Did push it out of farther question."

Henry V., Act i. Scene 1.

² Raynaldus, sub ann. 1426. Collier, E. H. B. vii. p. 633. Henry VI. was on the throne.

these affairs were with the King, not with St. Peter. Besides these hideous encroachments he has enacted terrible penalties against the clergy: Jews and Saracens are not treated with so much severity. People of all persuasions, of all countries, have the liberty of coming into England; except those who have cures bestowed upon them by the Supreme Bishop, by the Vicar of Christ Jesus. Those only are banished, arrested, imprisoned, stripped of their fortunes. Proctors or notaries charged with the execution of the mandates or censures of the Apostolic See, if they venture to set foot on English ground, and proceed in the fulfilment of their commission, are treated as the King's enemies, cast out of the King's protection, exposed to the extremest hardships. . . . Is this a Catholic kingdom? If any discipline or Apostolic censure is urged against this usage it is treated as a capital offence." The Archbishop is reminded that he is the successor of the glorious martyr St. Thomas. In the A.D. 1427. following year the Pope addressed the Parliament of England; and in a second letter to the Archbishop accused him of having irreverently and wickedly declared in public that the Apostolic See sought the abolition of that statute only from sordid pecuniary motives.

But Martin V., perhaps inadvertently, had wounded the pride and infringed on the dignity of the Cardinal Beaufort. Anglican Primate. Henry of Beaufort, it has been seen, the King's uncle, on his return from the Holy Land, had done good service at the Council of Constance¹ by his mediation between the conflicting parties. The Pope had rewarded him by creating him

¹ Dr. Lingard has inadvertently written Basil. — Hist. of England.

Cardinal of Winchester and Apostolic Legate in England. This usurpation on the Legatine power, of late held by Chicheley, and on the undisputed Primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury, could not be tamely endured. Chicheley had obtained from Henry V. a prohibition to the Bishop of Winchester to exercise Legatine power in England. The Regency, during the minority of Henry VI., would not receive Beaufort with the honors due to his rank, and demanded that he should surrender his Bishopric of Winchester, vacated by his acceptance of the Cardinalate. This Churchman had been appointed Captain-General of a crusade against the Hussites in Bohemia. The iniquity of this act, the employment of such a man in such a service (what said the Lollards in England?), brought its own shame and punishment. Beaufort raised money and troops in England for the crusade.¹ By a scandalous and intricate fraud these troops were poured into France to consolidate, defend, or advance the progress of the English arms under the Duke of Bedford. The King of France sent the bitterest complaints to Rome; Pope Martin was compelled to condemn this act of the Cardinal as injurious to the cause of religion, highly dishonorable to the See of Rome;² but Henry of Winchester did after all better service in Bohemia than all the Princes and Generals of the Empire. The English churchman, by his courage, put to shame the whole panic-stricken host.³ Beaufort returned to plunge into the politics of England, the implacable antagonist of him who was called the good Duke of Gloucester. Beaufort is that Cardinal consigned — in some degree

¹ Rymer.

³ See on, page 548.

² Compare Lingard, *Hist. of England*.

perhaps unjustly consigned — to everlasting torment by a decree, as far as the estimation of mankind, more powerful than Papal. His death of despair, described by Shakspeare, painted by Reynolds, is indelibly imprinted on the mind of man.¹

Archbishop Chicheley strove to maintain a middle course. He could not defy the Pope; he knew that he could not annul the law of England. He urged on a Parliament at Westminster the terrors of a Papal interdict on the land. The Parliament paid no further regard to these terrors than to petition the Pope to restore the Primate of England to his favor.²

Martin V. by no means openly rejected the yet imperious demand for reformation, which beyond the Alps had not relaxed its importunity; nor was he disposed altogether to elude that regular convocation of General Councils, at stated intervals, to which he had agreed before the dissolution of that of Constance. By the decree of Constance, confirmed by the Pope, Councils were to be held every five years. Pavia had
Council of Pavia.
A.D. 1423. been appointed as the seat of the next meeting. Accordingly, in the year 1423, a Council opened at Pavia, but it was attended only by Italian Prelates. The Transalpines either were afraid or unwilling to trust themselves and their cause on Italian ground; or perhaps they had intimation of an affair, to them comparatively of less interest, but which the Pope intended, as of more vital importance, at least

¹ Compare the House of Lancaster. — The sensible author concludes in favor of Beaufort, "that he was not much better nor much worse than the other Romish dignitaries of the fifteenth century." This as regards England is not quite fair in the times of Wykeham and Hallam. I cannot in Chicheley forget the munificent founder of All Souls, Oxford.

² Wilkins, Concilia. — Collier, i. 656.

to Papal Christendom, to supplant the general Reformation—the reunion of the Greek with the Latin Church. The Greek Emperor, pressed by the Ottoman Turks almost to the utmost, was inclined to buy the aid of the West by the surrender of his religious freedom: the Pope contemplated with lofty expectation the whole world reposing under his supremacy. Martin V. ere long evoked the Council of Pavia to Sienna: there he might take part in the Sienna.

proceedings, and urge on more vigorously the reconciliation of the Greeks. At Sienna appeared only five German Prelates, from France six, from Spain not one; but even this Council, after renewing the condemnation of Wycliffe, Huss, and their doctrines, came to an unwelcome resolution, that internal Church union by reform ought to take precedence of external union. The suffrages of the Nations were so decidedly in favor of this decree that the Pope took alarm at the dangerous spirit of innovation universal throughout Christendom: “that the Supreme Pontiff should be called to account was a perilous thing.”¹ Martin seized the specious pretext that so few Prelates could not pretend to represent the Church, as an occasion for the dissolution of the Council.² It was prorogued for seven years, then to meet in the German city of Basle.

¹ “Noverat oculatus Pontifex omnem multitudinem novitatis cupidam esse, iniqua in Romanos Pontifices judicia plebis, invidos patres, nihil periculosius quam maximi præsulatus reddere rationem. Arte igitur usus est,” p. 34. — *Æneæ Sylvii Comment.* This work of *Æneæ Sylvius* was first published at Rome by C. Fea, 1823. It is of great importance; I owe the use of it to my excellent friend the Chevalier Bunsen.

² Bull of Dissolution, March 12, 1424.

Martin V. just lived to see the opening of the Council of Basle. An apoplexy carried him off suddenly, and left to his successor that conflict with the Council which might perhaps have been avoided or mitigated by the experience, dexterity, and conciliatory manners of Pope Martin.

CHAPTER XI.

EUGENIUS IV. THE HUSSITE WAR.

MARTIN V., by the aggrandizement of his family, had not established a predominant influence *Conclave*. in the Conclave for the house of Colonna, nor even for the Roman clergy. The Cardinals met; they had been unduly depressed as they thought, doubtless kept in stern subordination, by Martin V.¹ Their first business was to erect themselves into a standing Council, superior to the Pope, so that without their advice the Pope could do nothing. They solemnly pledged themselves, whoever should be elected to the Popedom, to reform the Roman Court, in its head and in its members, with the Council of the Cardinals; not to remove it from Rome; to hold a General Council at intervals according to the decree of Constance; not to create Cardinals, or to do any important act without the advice of the Cardinals; to the Cardinals was to be assigned one moiety of the whole Papal revenue. All took this oath without hesitation, and kept it as the

¹ They (five Cardinals well disposed to the Teutonic Order, Orsini, Arles, De Comte, Rouen, Novara) dare not speak one word to the Pope but what he would willingly hear; for the Pope has so repressed the Cardinals that they never speak except according to his sentiments, and while they speak turn red and pale. — Voigt, *Stimmen*, p. 74. When Martin fled from Rome to Ferentino on account of the plague, he would not let a single Cardinal come near him.

Cardinals were wont to keep such oaths.¹ They then proceeded to the election. The contest lay between a Spaniard and a French Prelate. Neither would make concessions. Both parties threw away their suffrages on one whom none of the College desired or expected to succeed: their concurrent votes fell by chance on the Cardinal of Sienna.² Gabriel Condolmieri, Cardinal of Sienna, was the nephew, on a sister's side, of the abdicated Gregory XII.: he took
 March 8, 1431.
 Eugenius IV. the name of Eugenius IV.³ Bred a monk of the rigid Cœlestine Order, Eugenius had the narrow virtues of a monk, austere morals, rigorous discharge of the offices of devotion. He had likewise the hardness, self-sufficiency, stubbornness of a monk. His sudden elevation gave him overweening confidence in his own judgment: he implicitly believed in his own supremacy, and that he was invested by that supremacy in wisdom to maintain it. This was to him his one great duty, one paramount virtue. He was not averse to the reformation of the Church; he would willingly have submitted the whole clergy to the same austere discipline to which he had subdued his own person; but it must be reformation issuing from himself, granted by himself, regulated by himself; nor would he make any concession which would detract from the Papal power, hardly from the Papal wealth. To this all considerations of policy, human-

¹ Raynald. sub ann. 1431.

² Andreas Billius, Hist. Mediolan. Sismondi has represented Eugenius IV. as the most insignificant of all the Cardinals. Yet he had filled offices of high trust. He had been Legate in Romagna. — Platina, in Vitâ. .

³ The ambassador of the Teutonic Order deploras the parsimony of the Order, which will not enable him to vie in his gifts with other sovereigns. "The Venetians are used to gifts." — p. 110.

ity, fidelity to engagements, must be subordinate. He had the singular praise that he religiously observed all compacts, except those which it was for the advantage of his See to violate.¹ In policy, indeed, Eugenius IV. was a Venetian. He broke up at once the alliance maintained so successfully, as regarded the peace of Rome and the Roman territory, with the Visconti and Milan, and joined Florence and Venice with all his power. To war against his own refractory subjects, or against the enemies of his allies in Italy, Eugenius IV. had no scrupulous aversion. His panegyrist acknowledges his love of war;² but it was above all war against heretics, an exterminating war, war which admitted of no treaty. Against heretics it was religion to annul, infringe, tread under foot any compact; against them cruelty was mercy, perfidy justice. Yet there were those who, to their admiration of the beauty of the person of Eugenius, added that of his virtue and his equanimity.³

Eugenius began his Pontificate with an act of resolute violence, perhaps unavoidable, but which ungraciously exposed the one great vice of ^{First acts of} Eugenius IV. his predecessor, and ended in the most offensive condemnation of his memory. The vast wealth accumulated by Martin was in the hands of the Colonnas, the Cardinal Prospero, Antonio Prince of Salerno, Edward Count of Celano. The Pope demanded the surrender of these treasures, the inalienable inheritance of the

¹ "Constans præterea in pactis servandis est habitus, nisi quid pollicitus fuisset quod revocare quam perficere satius esset." — Platina.

² "Bella autem ita amavit, quod mirum in Pontifice videbatur." — Vit. Eugen. apud Muratori, S. R. I.

³ Antoninus of Florence; see also Æneas Sylvius, *Europa*, i. 48. Compare Weissenberg, ii. p. 280.

See. He stood in need of them, for all Romagna was in revolt; Perugia had driven out the Legate; Viterbo, Civita Castellana, Spoleto, Narni, Todi, were in arms. The Colonnas refused to disgorge their treasures. They fortified their castles; they proclaimed the Pope only a servile instrument in the hands of their enemies the Orsini; they broke with armed bands into the fiefs held by the Orsini, and laid all waste; but Rome was still in that state of loyal excitement which always followed for a short time the election of a new Pope. The love and reverence of Pope Martin were buried with him in his grave: it adhered not to his house. The Pope had power enough at his command to seize all the Colonnas in Rome. His vengeance was unscrupulous: he tortured Otho, the treasurer of Pope Martin, an aged man, till he expired; two hundred Roman citizens perished on the scaffold;¹ the palace of Martin V. was razed to the ground; his arms effaced from all public monuments. Florence and Venice, the new Pope's new allies, sent aid. The Prince of Salerno was attacked on all sides; his garrisons were ignominiously driven from the forts which he had seized; he was compelled to humiliating submission; all that remained of the treasures of Pope Martin, 75,000 golden florins, were surrendered to the Pope.² These vigorous measures secured to Eugenius the peaceable possession of Rome for two years, the last of which witnessed the coronation of the Emperor Sigismund.

This first success was followed by the subjugation of

¹ Muratori, *Ann. d' Italia*, sub ann. 1431; *Vita Eugenii Papæ*, S. R. I. iv.

² In the *Stimmen aus Rom*, Eugenius is favorably contrasted with Martin V. On the occasion of a favorable decree, the Ambassador writes, "I must have paid Pope Martin 1000 ducats more for this." — p. 114.

the Roman States. City after city yielded to the combined troops of the Free Companies in the pay of the Pope, of Florence, and of Venice, until the implacable and inexhaustible intrigues of the Duke of Milan raised again the banner of revolt. These triumphs at Rome were not likely to disenchant Pope Eugenius from his full faith in himself and in his Pontifical power. So plunged he at once into that long irreconcilable contest with Transalpine Christendom, from which however he might seem to emerge conqueror, and to bear down all resistance by stubborn resolution, his victory was dearly won, though its results might wait almost another century to come to maturity.

Now for the first time a Council beyond the Alps, that of Basle, stood up boldly on democratic principles, first against the Pope alone, afterwards against the Pope with a rival Council. At length the Transalpine Council set up its own Pope, and two Popes at the head of two General Councils distracted the worship and divided the obedience of Christendom.

The Hussite war had already almost filled the whole period of more than thirteen years, from the close of the Council of Constance to the opening of the Council of Basle. It lasted during all the Pontificate of Martin V., who contemplated it far aloof, if with horror and dismay, it is to be hoped, not without some commiseration, though he might think it his duty to stimulate it and keep it alive with all his authority. Safe in Rome, he heard but from a distance the thundering roll of Ziska's chariots, the shrieks of cities stormed, the wail of armies mowed down by the scythe. The war was still raging on at the accession of Eugenius, and at the meeting of the Council of

Basle.¹ They were years of terrible and fatal glory in the history of Bohemia, of achievements marvellous as to valor, military skill, patriotism, and the passion for civil and religious freedom; to the Empire, to the Teutonic nation, beyond all precedent disastrous and ignominious. Had Bohemia possessed a race of native Sovereigns; were it not in the nature of profound religious fanaticism to awaken differences irreconcilable under the most favorable circumstances; could Bohemia have consolidated her own strength within herself, and not carried fire and sword into the Empire, she might have been the first nation which threw off the yoke of the Pope and of the hierarchy, the centre of Sclavonian independence. But that Sclavonian Reformation might perhaps have retarded, from the hostility of the two races, imbittered by the long contest, the later, more successful, more irrevocable Teutonic emancipation.

Of all wars none was so horribly, remorselessly, ostentatiously cruel as this — a war of races, of languages, and of religion. It was a strife of revenge, of reprisal, of extermination considered to be the holiest of duties. On one side no faith was to be kept, no mercy shown to heretics: to cut off the spreading plague by any means was paramount to all principles of law or Gospel. On the other, vengeance was to be wreaked on the enemies of God's people, and therefore the enemies of God; to root out idolatry was the mission of the Bohemians; mortal sin was to be cut off with the righteous sword; and the whole priesthood, all monks,

¹ Compare in Palacky (*Geschichte Böhmens*) references to the MS. Histories of John of Ragusa and John of Segovia, iii. p. 518. Also in Martene and Durand, viii. 48, the Articles placarded in Rome demanding the Council, as the only means of putting an end to the Hussite war.

friars, nuns, were so utterly depraved, according to their sweeping condemnation, that it was only to fulfil the Divine commandment to extirpate the irreclaimable Order. These terrible theories ^{Atrocity of the war.} were relentlessly carried into more terrible practice. Kuttenberg, the second city in the realm, the rival of Prague, Catholic and German as Prague was Hussite and Bohemian, burned, beheaded, hanged all who would not retract their opinions. They bought the prisoners taken in war for a few groschens a head (five times as much for a preacher as for a common man), and executed them without trial, without mercy. They are charged with having put to death sixteen hundred men.¹ The Hussites, wherever they could, perpetrated horrible reprisals; for so many of their brethren as were burned, they hanged as many monks or friars.² The names assigned to their fortresses, and assumed by the more fanatic Hussites, Taborites, Horebites—show from which part of the Bible they drew their prevailing principles. Some of the preachers proclaimed the approaching end of the world. Christ was already coming, already come. The enemies of truth were to be exterminated; the good alone preserved, and put in the five faithful cities.³ Bohemia boasted, beyond all kingdoms of Europe, of her magnificent religious buildings, not in her cities alone, but in her villages. Fanaticism, maddened by persecution and by its own blind fury, warred on all that was splendid. The sky-aspiring churches, of vast length and width, on their

¹ Palacky, iii. 74-5.

² For the atrocity of the war, see the revolting account of the taking of Prachatic by Ziska, Palacky, p. 171.

³ Palacky, from Brezowa.

pillars and arching vaults of stone, the stately altars, where the relics of the saints were enshrined in gold and silver, the embroidered vestments inlaid with precious stones, the gorgeous vessels, the rich painted windows — all was demolished — all was ruin, havoc, desolation.¹

The execution of John Huss and Jerome of Prague had aroused a general access of national as well as religious indignation. But so long as King Wenzel lived the Bohemian insurrection had not attained its height. For Wenzel was a Bohemian in heart, as a Bohemian beloved by the people, and supposed, though he outwardly supported the old religion, not to be unfavorable to, at least he had taken no decided or violent part against the new doctrines. But on the death of Wenzel, the hereditary claim of Sigismund to the throne of Bohemia was undoubted — of Sigismund. Sigismund who had allowed his safe-conduct to be violated, and so was guilty of the death of the martyrs, even if he had taken no more active share in the murder. The act had been a breach of faith, an outrage to the Bohemian nation. Sigismund attempted to awe the reluctant kingdom to obedience. At Breslau he revenged an insurrection with such terrible se-

¹ Thus writes Æneas Sylvius, who had visited Bohemia: "Nullum vero regnum ætate nostrâ in totâ Europâ tam frequentibus, tam augustis, tam ornatis templis ditatum fuisse quam Bohemicum reor. Tempia in cœlum erecta, longitudine atque amplitudine mirabili fornicibus tegebantur lapideis; altaria in sublimi posita, auro et argento quo sanctorum reliquiæ tegebantur onusta; sacerdotum vestes margaritis textæ; ornatus omnis dives, pretiosissima supellex, fenestræ altæ atque amplissimæ vitro et admirabili opere lucem præbebant. Neque hæc tantum in oppidis atque urbibus sed in villis quoque admirari licebat." — *Hist. Bohemica*, c. 36. Bohemia bears sad witness to this revolution. Except the St. John Nepomuk on the Hradshin, all her churches are of the later Jesuit style.

verity, that Prague might stand aghast at the peril of resisting, or of receiving such a master. He burned without scruple all the heretical teachers that fell into his hands. John Kincha, a member at the Town Council at Prague, was dragged at horses' tails, and, after all this savage usage, died on the scaffold with the recklessness of a martyr. Two days after ^{March 17,} this, the Pope's Legate, Ferdinand of Lucca, ^{1420.} published the Bull for the Crusade.

Bohemia, following the example of Prague, rose at once and repudiated the sovereignty of Sigis- ^{The war.} mund. She had no native Prince to fight her battles. Hussinetz, who secretly aimed at the throne, perhaps fortunately for his country, died at an early period. Somewhat later the crown was accepted and worn by a Lithuanian Prince, Sigismund Korybert, finally deposed and expelled the land by the common consent of the nation.¹ But the armies of Bohemia needed no royal leaders. We must pass with rapidity, we cannot altogether avert our eyes from those terrible but noble scenes, the victories of Ziska and Procopius. The first crusade ended with the disgraceful defeat, with the shameful flight of the Emperor from the walls of Prague,² and the disastrous battle of ^{Battle of} Wyschebrad, ^{Nov. 1, 1420;}³ The second campaign saw the

¹ In 1427.

² Aschbach, iii. 47; compare his authorities with Palacky, iii. 91. The camp broke up July 30. Sigismund had gone through the idle ceremony of coronation.

³ The spirited poem in Palacky taunts Sigismund with personal cowardice: —

“Wie ein Has vor Hunden lief er,
Hätte Flügel er besessen.
Wär furwahr er fortgefliegen;
Solch ein tapfres Herz hatt' er,
Herr von sieben Königreichen.” — p. 168.

German army break up in panic flight from Saaz, with the now renowned and irresistible Ziska in the rear, bearing down whole squadrons, and revenging the unspeakable barbarities inflicted on his countrymen. The third year Sigismund advanced into Moravia at the head of the Hungarian forces; they too fled at once at the approach of Ziska with his wild war-chariots; they were overtaken at Deutschbrod, and massacred rather than routed by the remorseless conqueror. Bohemia seemed to be severed, and forever, from Latin unity. Conrad, the Archbishop of Prague, accepted, to the utter astonishment and dismay of the Church, the four articles of Prague.¹

Internal feuds were sure to break out immediately that the enemy was beyond the borders of Bohemia. The wealthy burghers of Prague (the nobles had entered the strife with reluctance) would have accepted a moderate share of religious independence. The four articles of Prague stipulated, I. For freedom of teaching by their own ministers throughout the realm. II. Communion in both kinds. III. That the clergy should not hold estates, nor mingle in secular affairs. IV. The punishment of deadly sins by the magistrates, with the suppression of indulgences for money. Whoever should compel them to abandon either of these articles they declared to be a most cruel tyrant, an Antichrist.² They were called the Utraquists, as insisting on the Eucharist in both elements. Ziska³ and the Taborites had wilder and

¹ Palacky, page 218.

² See Articles. — Palacky, 190.

³ Laurent. Bzov. p. 175. The character of Ziska in Palacky (p. 360,

loftier views: the national independence, far harsher measures to the clergy. There were among them, millenarians, communists. They swept away every vestige of traditional religion; everything but the barest, most unadorned worship. But to the old creed they still adhered with stern fidelity. Martinet Hauska and his followers were burned by both parties for denying Transubstantiation, or the real presence.¹ But neither these divisions nor the death of Ziska by the plague, weakened the indomitable resistance of the Oct. 12, 1424. Bohemians to their foreign foes. No sooner had the crusading army again crossed the borders, than the nation was one; the din of polemic strife was silent. The moderate party followed the Taborites to the field under their new general, almost the equal of Ziska in military skill. The blind Procopius, the shaven Procopius,² had been a priest;³ under him the Procopius. old Taborites, and the Orphans, the followers of Ziska, their lost father, as well as his own peculiar religious and political faction, met together in fierce, unconflicting unity. Under him the third crusade, ^{Battle of Aussitz.} which had lingered on for two or three years, ^{June 16, 1426.} was discomfited in the final battle of Aussitz. So total was the rout, that the Germans, not without cause, dreaded the irruption of these formidable conquerors

&c.) is just and striking. He was as stern a bigot for Christian virtue as his enemies for their Christian creed or discipline.

¹ Palacky, 236.

² Palacky writes of Procopius: — "Wenn er Ziska in kriegerischer Genialität nicht glick, ihm doch an Geist und politischen Umblick übertraf." — P. 432.

³ Procopius solemnly declared before the Council of Basle that he had never shed a drop of blood with his own hand. He had commanded in many battles: but Bohemia had been compelled to war by the Pope and the Cardinals: to them belonged all the guilt.

into their own territories. Erfurt, Jena, Halle, even Magdeburg, already saw the fierce Procopius, and heard the rattlings of his wagons under their walls.¹

Shame, indignation, terror, prudence, demanded a better organized, better disciplined army, than those which had been hastily raised in different parts of Germany. The banner of the Empire was unfurled. From the Danube and its Hungarian shores up to the Black Forest—from the Alps to the border of Flanders, contingents were required; temporal and spiritual powers, nobles and bishops, knights and burghers, crowded to the Imperial standard; 200,000 men were in arms.² A new Order was instituted; the banner bore the Virgin and the Infant Saviour.³ All this magnificent preparation ended in almost incredible disgrace. The three divisions of the vast army, or rather the three armies, fled without striking a blow, abandoning all their treasures, munitions, carriages, cannon. Henry of Winchester alone, at the head of a band of English crusaders, endeavored, but in vain, to arrest the utter rout.

July 12 and
following
days.
Great flight,
Aug. 4, 1427.

The Crusades against the Hussites had made the Hussites what the Saracens had long been to the Christian world, and they became as Saracens to the whole of Germany. They would no longer wait to be assailed. They assembled on the White Mountain near Prague, 50,000 foot, 20,000 horse, with their impregnable wagons which they built up as a fortress at a few hours' warning, a garrisoned

Bohemian
invasion of
Germany.

¹ Palacky, p. 414.

² Herman Corner, p. 1278.

³ Raynald. sub ann. 1427. Palacky, p. 439.

citadel in the enemy's land. On every side they broke out unresisted, except by the stronger cities. Austria, even as far as Hungary, Lausitz, Saxony, were a waste. Leipsic escaped only through her fortifications. Co-bourg and Bayreuth were in flames. Nuremberg, Bamberg, closed their gates in terror. The Marquis of Brandenburg, the Bishop of Bamberg, bought their retreat at great cost. Everywhere revenge, religious hatred, fierce fanaticism, marked their way with unspeakable horrors. They thought it but compliance with the Divine command to dispeople the lands of the Philistines, the Edomites, and the Moabites.

Sigismund at length attempted milder measures ; pacific negotiations began, but the religious *Negotiations.* question could not be reconciled. The Emperor demanded the unqualified submission of the Bohemians to the decrees of a General Council, to which they were to be admitted in perfect freedom. The Taborites, who might well mistrust, would contract no such obligations. The Orphans, Ziska's section of the milder party, promulgated the new doctrine, that a free people needed no king.

Nothing remained but a fifth crusade. An army of 100,000 men crossed the Bohemian fron- From Aug. 1 to 14. tier. In the battle of Taass the Bohemians Battle of Taass, Aug. 14, 1431. won a victory no less signal and complete than on former fields. Again the Pope's Legate, the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, alone conducted himself with courage ; he was at last constrained to fly ; he hardly escaped in the disguise of a common soldier, and left behind him the Papal Bull for the crusade, his cardinal's hat, and his pontifical robes. These

trophies remained in the church of Taass for two centuries ; the banners were hung in the Tron Church in Prague.¹

¹ There is a fair general view of these wars in Aschbach, *Kaiser Sigmund*, vol. iii. ; but the more full, careful and accurate one from MS. as well as printed authorities in Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*.

CHAPTER XII.

COUNCIL OF BASLE.

SUCH was the state of the Hussite or Bohemian war on the opening of the Council of Basle under John of Polcmar and John of Ragusa, delegates of the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini. On July 23 the Council held its first sitting; in the beginning of August A.D. 1431. was fought the crowning victory of Procopius, the battle of Taass. Bohemia might seem lost forever to King Sigismund, to the Pope, to Latin Christianity. The Cardinal himself had witnessed the valor, with difficulty had fled out of the hands, of the unconquerable Taborites. The intelligence of the defeat struck the Council with the utmost consternation; the Fathers began to take even more serious views of the absolute and inevitable necessity of reformation in the Church.¹

Eugenius IV. was obstinately ignorant, imperfectly informed, or contemptuously regardless of the state of affairs beyond the Alps. The calamities which Germany had suffered in this internecine war for nearly fourteen years were beneath the consideration of a Pontiff whose one principle was no peace with heretics.

¹ "Quibus auditis, omnibus postpositis, consternati omnes patres de concilio . . . recesserunt, multa in animo ruminantes, et nihilominus fortius accensi ad reformationem Ecclesiæ." — John de Ragusio, MS. quoted by Palacky, iii. 3, 6.

Eugenius had no intention to venture his sacred person beyond the Alps ; but a Council not under his own immediate control was a dangerous experiment, which he would if possible avert. Of all things he was affrighted by the manifest determination to enter into peaceful negotiations with the Hussites, with whom he had already declared all treaties null and void, with whom no treaties, on any account, ought to be respected, with whom to negotiate was to suffer a rehearing of questions already decided at Constance and at Sienna, and to admit the possibility that such heretics might have a good cause. A treaty with heretics (according to the language of the Pope's Bull) confirmed, as it was said to have been, with mutual oaths, was an insult to God, a blasphemy against the Pope's authority. Without faith salvation was impossible. The Pope therefore abrogated all such treaties, should they exist, in all their articles ; he absolved from their oaths princes, prelates, knights, soldiers, magistrates of cities ; he commanded them, notwithstanding any such treaty, to rise in a mass, and besiege, slay, exterminate heretics, so that their heresy might perish forever.¹

Without delay, without consideration, almost without consultation with the Cardinals, Eugenius issued his Decree, commanding the dissolution of the Council of Basle and the assembly of another after two years at Bologna. The reasons which he deigned to allege were that as yet but few prelates had appeared at Basle ; that the roads to Basle were insecure on account of the war between the Dukes of Burgundy and Austria ; above all, the greater convenience of the ambassadors from Constantinople. The Byzantine Em-

¹ Raynald. p. 88, sub ann. 1431.

pire, in its growing agony of dread at the approach of the Turks, had made still more urgent overtures to purchase aid from the West by the submission of the Greek Church to the Pope and to Latin Christianity.

The Legate, Julian Cæsarini, at first so far respected the decree of the Pope that he declined to take his seat as President of the Council. But Cæsarini was a wise and experienced man, he knew well the state of Germany. Even before the arrival of the final Papal mandate for the dissolution, he had addressed a remonstrance, remarkable for its firmness, vigor, dignity; above all, for its weighty and authoritative statement of the sound and just policy of maintaining the Council. "Germany is ready for another campaign in Bohemia; they only await aid and money from Rome. I thought you would have sold your crosses and chalices for such an object. I wait five months; instead of succor I receive an order to dissolve the Council, which is the only hope of union and success." Cæsarini's personal remonstrances to the Pope lest he should stand in the way of the reform of the clergy are most solemn and earnest — "he will be suspected of the grossest hypocrisy as to his own virtue." In his answer to the Bull,¹ the Cardinal Legate almost Dec. 13, 1431. scornfully disposes of the reasons of the Pope for the prorogation of the Council. "There were few Bishops at the first session, now they are gathering from all quarters. The Emperor has declared the Council under his protection; the Dukes of Burgundy and Austria have suspended their feud, and grant safe-conduct to the Holy Fathers. The peace of Germany is not to

¹ These two letters are in the Works of Æneas Sylvius, at the close of his Hist. Concil. Basil.

be sacrificed for the old song, which has rung in the ears of Western Europe for three centuries and ended in nothing, the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin Churches. The Bohemians have been deliberately, formally invited to the Council; arms have been tried in vain; this is the only way in which they can be restored to the Church. What will the heretics say if the Council be dissolved? Will they not, in their insulting and warrantable pride, proclaim that the Church dares not confront them? Will it not be held a confession of weakness? 'Behold, their armies have fled (how often!) from before our face, and now the Catholic Church flies again before us.' Such will be their boast. They are unconquerable in controversy as in war; the hand of God is with them: they hold the truth, we falsehood.

"What will the world say? Council after Council and no reformation! The incorrigible clergy will submit to no amendment. The whole laity will fall upon us like the Hussites.¹ Terrible rumors are abroad. Men's minds are in travail; they are ready to vomit forth their deadly venom: they will think it a sacrifice to God if they shall murder or despoil the clergy. The priesthood will become odious to God and man; the slight reverence which now remains will die away. Already Magdeburg has expelled her archbishop and clergy, and is preparing wagons to wage war like the Hussites; it is rumored that they have sent for a Bohemian general. It is greatly to be feared that Magdeburg is the head of a league among the neighboring cities. Passau has expelled her Bishop, who

¹ "Propter quod valde timendum est, nisi se emendent, ne laici in more Hussitarum in totum clerum irruant ut publice dicunt." — P. 66.

was lord of the city; they are even now besieging his castle. In Bamberg there is war between the city and the Bishop and Chapter. Yet not only is the Council to be prorogued to Italy, but to be adjourned for a year and a half. In a year and a half I fear that the whole clergy of Germany will be in a state of ruin. If the news spreads throughout Germany that the Council is dissolved, the whole clergy will be given up to pillage and massacre. 'We shall lose our temporalities.' So said the Jews, 'If we let him go, the Romans will come and take away our place and nation.' And thus say we, 'If we permit the Council to sit, the laity will come and take away our temporalities.' But as by God's justice the Jews, who would not let Christ go, lost their place, so by God's justice if we allow not the Council to sit, we shall lose, not our temporalities only, but our bodies and our souls." The Cardinal ends with earnest supplication that the Pope will at least wait till July, when the heretics were to appear, to frame some canons for the reformation of the German clergy. "If I refuse the Presidency," he concludes, "they will at once proceed to elect their own President."

Magdeburg, Passau, and Bamberg were not the only cities in which the burghers had risen against their bishops, or were prepared to rise. In ^{State of} ^{Germany.} Aix-la-Chapelle, Cologne, Erfurt, Spire, Wurtzburg, Strasburg, feuds were raging; the burghers called in the neighboring princes who were ready to aid them in throwing off the ecclesiastical rule. Was then the crisis so perilous? If the Council of Basle had offered no resistance, and submitted at once to be prorogued to Bologna, is it possible that Germany (worn out by the

long war, and exasperated at her own disgrace and misery, of which all would throw the blame on the clergy) might not have disdained to follow the guidance of Bohemia, that the Sclavonian might have become a Teutonic movement, and thus a Wycliffite Reformation anticipated by a century that of Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin?

But the Council of Basle now boasted the avowed support of the Emperor and of the Duke of Milan, and scrupled not to send ambassadors to all the other courts of Europe. Their envoys asserted that the Council was lawfully assembled under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; that all men, even the Roman Pontiff, were bound to render their obedience; that the dissolution of the Council by Eugenius IV. was absolutely null. The Bishop of Novara was sent to Charles, King of France; the Bishop of Lodi to Henry of England; the Bishop of Parma to Poland and Prussia; the Abbot of St. Ambrogio in Milan to Alfonso of Arragon; the Abbot of Beauvale to Castile. The Abbot of Clairvaux was to address that great Prince the Duke of Burgundy.

Already the Council began to administer the affairs of Christendom as the great Christian Senate. But at Basle there was a fatal departure from the usage established at Constance. The voting by nations was abrogated, partly, it should seem, in jealousy of the admission of England as the fifth nation:¹ Spain claimed to rank as the fourth. Four deputations were

¹ There was great strife for precedence between the ambassadors of Spain and England. The Bishop of Parma writes to the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order: "Hic fuit magna disceptatio super modo sedendi inter ambasciatores regis Ispaniarum et regis Angliæ; tandem operante Deo, sedata est." — Compare Voigt, *Stimmen*, p. 64.

formed. I. Of faith. II. Of pacification. III. Of reformation. IV. Of other matters. Magistrates were appointed to examine and to distribute those who claimed the right of seat and suffrage ^{Right of voting.} among these deputations. No dignitary of the Church was rejected who was not a criminal or of evil fame. The result of this was the enormous preponderance of the German and French clergy : being nearer to Basle they poured in with overwhelming numbers. Comparatively few would undertake the long, perilous, and costly journey from Italy, Spain, England, Hungary. The second innovation was even more serious — the annulment of the dominant episcopal authority. The Bishops lost their prerogative, their influence. Bitter complaints were made that the meanest and most ignorant (the Universities, the Doctors of Canon and Civil Law do not appear prominently), the very dregs and lees of the clergy, carried all questions with a total forfeiture of dignity and utter confusion. It became a fierce democracy.¹

The Emperor Sigismund, abandoning for the present all hope of reconquering Bohemia, and wisely ^{Sigismund in Italy;} leaving the negotiations with the Council to ^{A.D. 1431.} work their effect, chose this time for a descent into Italy to receive the Imperial Crown. Philippo Maria Visconti had made magnificent promises of aid. The

1 " Sic turba inconsulta confusaque, cum docti atque indocti passim admitterentur, tantaque multitudo plebeis facis implevit synodum ut nulla vox esset, nullaque potestas episcoporum: quia non ratione sed numero vota congregationis aestimabantur." — *Æneas Sylvius*, *Fea*, p. 46. In a speech reported in *Mansi*, p. 231, it is said: " Inter Episcopos ceterosque patres conscriptos vidimus in Basiliâ coquos et stabularios orbis negotia judicantes." This is no doubt aristocratic, probably Italian exaggeration, but it shows the prevailing jealousies.

Duke of Milan now stood almost alone against Florence, Venice, and the Pope. Sigismund came down the Alps with not more than 2000 German and Hungarian horse. Milan welcomed him with a splendid display of feudal honors. He received the Iron Crown of Lombardy from the Archbishop of Milan in the *in Milan*; Church of St. Ambrogio. The Duke of Milan alone, notwithstanding his own words, stood aloof in sullen suspicion. He shut himself up in his castle of Abbiate Grosso. He remembered, perhaps, the seizure of his ancestors by the predecessor of Sigismund, the last Emperor who had entered Milan on his descent into Italy.

Sigismund passed onward to the south. If his allies *in Sienna.* looked on his progress with ungracious and *July 11, 1432.* inhospitable coldness, the Guelfic republics hardly abstained from molesting his march; but all parties were exhausted with the wars of the latter years. Sigismund reached Sienna, till then nowhere welcome; he hardly escaped being besieged in Lucca by the Free Companies in the pay of Florence. Sienna received him with some show of joy and pride. His father, Charles IV., had entered Sienna soon after his marriage; the Siennese hailed the Emperor as a fellow-citizen begotten within their walls. At first they were lavish in their contributions, but during eight long months of subtle negotiation with the Pope the weary city was overburdened with his costly and unprofitable maintenance.

And still the Council of Basle, emboldened by the controversy of Cæsarini with the Pope, emboldened by increasing numbers, went on rising in its loftier assumption of authority. The first act was to adopt the ex-

treme assertion of the Council of Constance as to the supremacy of a General Council over the Pope. The doctrine of Gerson and of Hallam found a new, a bold, and an eloquent advocate in Nicolas of Cusa, a man of the most fervent piety and commanding blamelessness of life. The Council constantly received letters of adhesion from Kings, Princes, Bishops, Universities, Cities. The number of Prelates was steadily on the increase; Cardinals, not merely two or three from personal animosity to Eugenius IV., but in considerable numbers, began to fall away from the Pope, to approach, singly and at intervals;¹ though some still hesitated to appear in the Council. The Cardinal of St. Peter, John Cervantes, fled in the disguise of a servant from Amelia. At length not more than four Cardinals remained with the Pope. In vain Eugenius sent forth his inhibitory letters denouncing the Council as the Synagogue of Satan, declaring all excommunicate who went to the Council or aided others in going; that these infected sheep ought to be exterminated; that those would please God who should rise up against, plunder, slay these rebels against the Apostolic See, the fautors of schism, the abettors of division. "It is marvellous but true," that the more Eugenius threatened, the more all flocked to Basle; the inhibition of the Pope had more effect than the summons of the Council.² The Council, in this third Session, issued its citation to the Pope and to the Cardinals, and threatened them with further proceedings

¹ Voigt, *Stimmen*.

² *Æneas Sylvius, Fea*. "Nec pauciores, ut mea fert opinio, Eugenii prohibitio viros adduxit, quam vocatio conciliaris." The historian adds: "Quia vetitum quicquid est, magis optamus, insistimusque negatis." — P. 48.

if they did not appear in three months. In a subsequent Session they declared that in case of the decease of Eugenius IV. the election of the Pope was in the Council. They prepared a Great Seal, they sent the Cardinal of St. Eustachio to take possession of Avignon and the Venaisin. The Pope's four Legates, who appeared with the Archbishops of Tarento and Colocza at their head, were not permitted to assume the Presidency. Their protestations that all which had been done without the Pope's consent was null and void, were treated with contempt. On the Pope was thrown back the guilt of schism. On September 6 the Pope and seventeen Cardinals were proclaimed in contumacy, because they had not appeared, and because they had issued the Bull for the dissolution of the Council.

Sigismund was still at Sienna, in a situation at once proud and humiliating ;¹ he was formidable, yet, as he described himself, through the treachery of the Duke of Milan, like a wild beast in a cage ; a mediator without power to enforce his mediation ; courted by all, yet fully obeyed by none ; hoping to receive the Imperial crown, yet dependent on extorted or almost eleemosynary contributions for his daily subsistence. The Council looked up to him, yet unjustly mistrusted him. The Pope feared, yet, until the coronation, had him to a certain extent in his power. Sigismund in honor and in interest could not abandon the Council ; in honor, for he was a high-minded, generous man, pledged by years of consistent determination to the reform of the Church ; in interest, for only through the conciliatory

¹ Aschbach, Kaiser Sigmund. The residence of Sigismund at Sienna is minutely detailed in Rascia, Hist. Senen. Muratori, S. R. I. v. xx. p. 48.

demeanor of the Council to the Bohemians could he regain the crown, which by the inflexible obstinacy of the Pope he must irrecoverably lose. The Pope had endeavored to extort as the price of Sigismund's coronation (that coronation he could not, he dared MAY 30, 1433. not longer refuse) the dissolution of the Council of Basle. The coronation was celebrated at Rome in the spring; but the Emperor would not yield. The Reformation of the Church had been the declared, ostentatious object of his whole reign. All that the Pope could obtain was the promised intercession of the Emperor with the Fathers of Basle not to proceed to any harsh decree against the Pope.¹ Sigismund returned over the Alps, he descended towards Basle. The Council, even the Cardinal Julian, would listen to no terms; Sigismund must acquiesce no doubt, with but seeming reluctance.

At length Eugenius IV. was compelled to yield. Already before the Emperor's coronation he had admitted, in a limited way, the legitimacy of the Council. There was still much jealous, ungenerous, dilatory disputation as to the terms in which he should make the concession. But at length, after more than two years' strife and negotiation, the Council of Basle was declared a lawful Œcumenic Council from its commencement.² The Bull of Dissolution was absolutely revoked. Sigismund had the satisfaction, before he left DEC. 15, 1433. Basle,³ to see the Council established in full authority, and to take his place at its head.

¹ "Ne quid adversus eum durè decernerent." — *Æneas Sylv.* p. 54.

² "Decernimus et declaramus . . . Concilium Basiliense a tempore prædictæ inchoationis suæ legitimè continuatum fuisse et esse." The full recognition was no doubt influenced by the insurrection at Rome. See on.

³ He was at Basle, almost without interruption, from Oct. 11, 1433, to April 12, 1434.

Before the Emperor left the Council, he submitted for the consideration of the Fathers the all-important question, the marriage of the clergy. John of Lubeck was to demand in the Emperor's name, in the name of the public morals, the abrogation of their fatal celibacy. John of Lubeck is described as a man of wit, indulging in jests on every occasion. But nothing could be more fearfully serious than the representation on this subject, which John was to lay separately before each deputation, and urge in the strongest manner. After centuries of strife, after all the laws of Hildebrand and his successors, the whole clergy are declared to be living with concubines, in adultery, or worse. They were hated by the whole laity as violating their marriage-beds; confession was become odious. There was strong fear lest the wealth of the clergy should be alienated to their legitimate children; even were it so, better the loss of wealth than of chastity. The Greek Church admitted marriage. The priests of the Old and New Testaments were married. The greater part of the Council were favorable to the change,¹ except only some of the old, whose days of marriage had gone by, and the Monks, jealous lest the secular Clergy should have privileges denied to themselves. Yet one, a Cardinal, declared in the spirit, almost in the words, of old Paphnutius at Nicea, that though himself aged, he earnestly desired that wives should be *restored* to the Priesthood.² The

¹ "Res erat complurimis accepta, sed tempori non convenire."

² The Cardinal of St. Peter said: "Quamvis senio gravior, neque mentem habeo ad conjugium, sanctum tamen arbitror, uxores *restitui* sacerdotibus: quia non est omnibus gratia Dei concessa, ut legi lumborum resistent, ut de Paulo legimus." There is a very curious passage on this subject in the *Nemus Unionis* of Theodoric à Niem (Tr. vi. c. 35) about the clergy of Norway and Ireland. The Norwegians, both lay and clergy, were great drinkers of ale, and would drink against each other till neither

question, as unsuited to the time, was eluded, postponed, dropped.¹

The Council of Basle had thus obtained an unlimited recognition of its authority, but the Fathers of that Council could not but know that it was an extorted recognition, and that from a most reluctant Pope. For the Council of Basle stood in very different relation to the Pope from those of Pisa or of Constance. Pisa was a Council of Cardinals, driven into revolt by the tergiversations of the two rival Pontiffs; the Italians by the abominable cruelties of Urban VI. As Cardinals, these Prelates assumed at least the lead in the Council; declared their right to depose the two contesting Popes, and to fill the vacancy by a creation of their own. At Constance, the Fathers of the Council sat as arbiters between three contending Pontiffs, one of whom, a despised and almost forgotten exile, had with difficulty found refuge in his native land of Venice; one was shut up in a fortress in Spain; one had rashly delivered himself, bound hand and foot by the

could stand. But in both countries bishops and priests publicly kept their concubines: and when the bishops went on their visitations, the clergy insisted that they should take their own "*amasie*" with them, lest they should be tempted by the superior beauty of those of the clergy. If the clergyman had not a "*focaria*," he paid double procurations ("*ut prævaricator paternarum traditionum, Episcopo visitante proinde procuraciones duplices ministrabat*"). The wives (?) of the clergy in Ireland took rank: "*Ac etiam presbyterorum amasie seu uxores in eisdem partibus, statu et gradu in ecclesiâ, in mensis, eundo, sedendo, et stando, cæteris dominabus etiam militaribus proponuntur.*" The same marriage or concubinage, with the advancement of the children (*ex fædo complexu nati*) to benefices, prevailed in Germany, Spain, and Portugal. It must be remembered that this is from Theodoric à Niem. I shall hereafter refer to unanswerable evidence on this repulsive subject from records of Visitations.

¹ "*Vicit tamen sententia illorum qui hoc tempore tantum opus aggrediendum negavere.*" See the whole very curious passage in *Æneas Sylvius, Fea*, p. 55.

crimes of his former life, into their hands. He had tried, but in vain, to break his bonds; he was abandoned by all Christendom. No sooner was there a Pope, Martin V., than he was acknowledged by the Council and by the whole West. He resumed at once the full supremacy over the Church. But the Council of Basle, if summoned by a Pope, and duly convened according to the decrees of former Councils, sat on one side of the Alps, and the Pope on the other; neither had any force to compel submission to its decrees. Eugenius IV. had so far been in uncontested possession of Rome and of the throne of St. Peter; if embroiled in Italian politics, with no apprehension that either the Italian potentates or the Italian clergy, still less that any formidable majority among the Cardinals, would take the part of the Council against the Pope.

A sudden insurrection had compelled Eugenius to fly May 15, 1434. in a mean disguise from Rome. The Romans had thrown his nephew, the Cardinal of Venice, into prison, chosen a Senate, installed magistrates. They sent an embassy to Basle to arraign Eugenius; "they had cast out the proud Tarquin." Rome, in their language, was a city of Bruti, Scævolaë, Horatii, Catones.¹ The Pope was received in Guelfic Florence. The Patriarch of Alexandria, John Vitelleschi, a ferocious and able Condottier (he had already hanged the famous Oct. 26, 1434. Antonio of Pisa for violating the Papal territory), appeared with his terrible troops under the walls of Rome. Not a Brutus nor a Cato would lay down his life. The people submitted ignominiously to return to their allegiance. But the Pope, as a punishment for their unruliness, or in mistrust,

April 18,
1436.

¹ This may be the classic irony of *Aeneas Sylvius*, p. 61.

now honored Bologna as his residence.¹ Behind the strong walls of Bologna, secure in the succor of Venice and of Florence, he was beyond the reach of the intrigue or violence of his deadly enemy, Philippo Visconti of Milan ; and he might watch with serene composure the proceedings at Basle, ready to seize every opportunity of advantage or of revenge.

The Council of Basle, on the other hand, might as yet pursue its deliberations in dignified security, but no more. There was no great monarch to espouse their cause or give weight to their decrees. The Emperor Sigismund's final act of imposing power was his appearance in the Council. The two last years of his reign were more than inglorious, ignominious. He was succeeded for two disturbed years by his son Albert. Frederick III., the new Emperor elected on Feb. 2, 1440. the death of Albert, surrendered himself to the treacherous guidance of Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, at first the bold assertor of ecclesiastical freedom in the Council, then skilfully preparing his own way, first to Bishops, Cardinalates, finally to the Popedom, by calming down Germany to an undignified neutrality. Charles VII. governed hardly half of France. The King of England for the time ruled in Paris, and that king was the feeble, devout Henry VI. The only sovereign who seemed to take much interest in the proceedings of the Council was Alfonso of Castile, in virtue of his Sicilian or Neapolitan connections.

Thus, then, the Pope and Council sat at first in disguised, before long in open, oppugnancy, but their hostility was confined to Declarations and Acts which neither could maintain but by words. Each asserted

¹ Muratori, sub ann. 1436. Till this time he had remained in Florence.

his prerogative to the utmost; the Council its own supremacy over all Christendom, including the Pope — its function was to reform the Church in its head and in its members; the Pope averred that the Council sat only by his permission, derived from him its limited authority, was guilty of ecclesiastical treason by any invasion of the all-comprehending Papal supremacy.

If the Council of Basle was wanting in the presence or the support of the great royal powers, as an Ecclesiastical Senate it was august enough. Though the most learned Fathers of Constance had passed away — D'Ailly, Gerson, Zabarella, the Cardinal of St. Mark, Hallam — it boasted representatives of the Church from almost every quarter of Christendom. Among these was the Cardinal Louis, Archbishop of Arles, the President after the secession of the Cardinal Julian Cæsarini to Ferrara. His lofty independence and resistance to the Papal See did not prevent his subsequent canonization.¹ Among the Prelates from Spain was the Archbishop of Palermo. From France came Thomas de Corcelles; from Deventer in Holland, Nicolas de Cusa, whose fame stood almost the highest among the theologians of the day. Nicolas de Cusa, a conscientious zealot for the reform of the Clergy, was afterwards decoyed from the Council by the adroit flattery of Pope Eugenius. "His peerless learning was absolutely necessary to conduct the negotiations with the Greek Church, now returning into the bosom of Rome." He went to Florence; and once within the magic circle, he left not the Papal Court during the

¹ Æneas Sylvius describes Louis as "*homo multarum parabolarum, liberalitate insignis, sed odio erga Eugenium veteri et novo accendissimus.*" — P. 67.

sittings of the Council.¹ Last and most important was Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, an Italian, the most elegant writer of Latin, the historian of the Council — at one time its ruling authority, at another its most dangerous, because secret, foe.

The Council of Basle stood firm on the unshaken ground of the established theology; not a whisper of suspicion attainted the doctrinal orthodoxy of its Fathers. The concessions to the Bohemian insurgents were avowedly extorted in order to save Germany from their inroads. It was a far-sighted policy, a policy conducted by the Fathers of Basle (especially the President Cardinal Cæsarini) with dignity and moderation which might command the admiration and gratitude of Christendom. According to the compact of A.D. 1438.

Eger the ambassadors of Bohemia appeared at Basle. The theological questions arising out of the four Articles of Prague were discussed on the whole with singular sedateness, and with an earnest, almost an affectionate desire for union. On the side of the Bohemians stood Rokycana, now the acknowledged head of the Utraquists; Peter Payne, the Englishman; the Priest-warrior Procopius, as ready in theological dispute as in battle; on the other the most learned theologians of France, Germany, some of Italy. Julian Cæsarini presided with gentle dignity. The occasional outbursts of irresistible scorn and oppugnancy were repressed by common consent.² The concession of Communion in both kinds seemed determined, at least to a certain extent. The other Articles were eluded or compromised.

¹ I have read a prolix and laborious life of Nicolas of Cusa by G. M. Dax, Regensburg, 1847.

² Palacky, iii. 3, ch. ii.

But these concessions, and the long-protracted negotiations which ensued, were fatal to the unity, and so to the strength of Bohemia. Dissensions arose: they could not but arise. The concessions were ambiguous, variously interpreted, received with eagerness, rejected with passion. The dragon's teeth were sown, the armed men sprang up. Nobles and Burghers, Utraquists and Taborites, were in open, deadly feud, or in secret counterworking hostility. The war, never entirely discontinued, broke out again. The disastrous May 30, 1434. battle of Lepan broke forever the spell of Bohemian invincibility. Procopius the Great fell in the field; with Procopius fell the military glory, the religious inflexibility of Bohemia. After some time Sigismund Aug. 24, 1436. Sigismund (he still lived) ascended the throne; he was received in Prague. Rokycana was permitted to accept the barren dignity of Archbishop of Prague. The able Philip, Bishop of Coutances, then Legate of the Council of Basle, exercised the real ecclesiastical authority. On Sigismund's death, the crown of Bohemia was the object of a fierce contest between his son, the Austrian Albert, and Casimir of Poland. But it was a strife of Slavonian and German. The religious interest, the religious passions, were well-nigh burnt out. Tabor, Sion, were besieged and fell. The great Slavonian Reformation was at an end; it lived only in its impulses, its glorious reminiscences, its opinions, the clang of its debates, which still rang in European remembrance; hereafter disembarassed of some of its wilder tenets, to wake to final victory in the more sober, steadfast, reflective Teutonic mind. The Council of Basle had perhaps averted doctrinal reformation for above a century.

The ostensible and paramount purpose of the Council of Basle was the Reform of the Clergy. From all quarters the solemn admonitions, the grave expostulations of the more devout and rigid, the bitter satire of the wits of the day, the denunciations of the enemies of the Clergy had been deepening since the Council of Constance had eluded this perilous question. Still there was no thought of a religious revolution ; a revolution, in modern phrase strictly conservative was its utmost aim. Its highest ambition was to reduce the arbitrary autocracy of the Pope to a constitutional monarchy, in order to strengthen not to overthrow that monarchy. The Pope was to take a solemn oath on his inauguration to respect certain rights and liberties of the Church : the College of Cardinals was to be restricted to a certain number, but they were to be the standing Council, in some degree an authoritative Council, to the Pope ; the Senate of the Church. On the other hand, against the concubinage of the Clergy the Council were now as rigid as Gregory or Innocent. For the first conviction the offender incurred deprivation of all emoluments for three months ; for obstinate disobedience, degradation.

Yet the reform of the hierarchy must begin with the Head. The immoderate taxation of the Roman Court ; the Annates and other charges ; the usurpations of the Popes as to the promotions to the richer benefices, lay at the root of many of the abuses. The axe must strike boldly and relentlessly at the heart of the evil. Here began the open, obstinate, irreconcilable collision. The Council on these points would not yield, the Pope would not for a moment relax his grasp. Against each usurpation, as he declared it, on the inextinguishable

rights of the successors of St. Peter, so soon as the decree reached him he protested with the most uncompromising haughtiness. Papal power had never been advanced in more undisguised or peremptory language. In the Pope was the absolute right of conferring all benefices; from him emanated all spiritual power: he was the Bishop of Bishops, the sole fountain, the arbiter, the dispenser, the distributor of ecclesiastical authority. So was war fully declared between the Pope and the Council; their utterly irreconcilable pretensions had come into direct conflict. The Council would limit the Pope; the Pope would endure no limitation.

END OF VOL. VII.

21

3



